Reexamining the Crisis: Civil-Military Relations During the Clinton Administration

A Monograph

by

MAJ John A. McLaughlin

U.S. Army

School of Advanced Military Studies

United States Army Command and General Staff College

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

AY 2008

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			*Form Approved* OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)* 01-12-2008	2. REPORT TYPE Monograph	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)* 07-01-08 – 05-12-08
Reexamining the Crisis: Civil-Military Relations During the Clinton Administration Unclassified		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
		5b. GRANT NUMBER
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S) McLaughlin, John A.		5d. PROJECT NUMBER
		5e. TASK NUMBER
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) US Army School of Advanced Military Studies Eisenhower Hall 250 Gibbon Ave Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER ATZL-SWV
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
See Abstract

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Civil-military relations, President Clinton, United States, democracy, government, Goldwater-Nichols Act, General Colin Powell, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified	Same as report (SAR)	63	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER *(include area code)*

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

Major John A. McLaughlin

Title of Monograph: Reexamining the Crisis: Civil-Military Relations during the Clinton Administration

This monograph was defended by the degree candidate on 18 September, 2008 and approved by the monograph director and reader named below.

Approved by:

_____   Monograph Director
Dan C. Fullerton, Ph. D.

_____   Monograph Reader
Michael J. Johnson, LTC(P), AR

_____   Director,
Stefan J. Banach, COL, IN   School of Advanced
                                                                   Military Studies

_____   Director,
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.   Graduate Degree
                                                                   Programs

Abstract

Reexamining the Crisis: Civil-Military Relations during the Clinton Administration by MAJ John A. McLaughlin, U.S. Army (59 pages)

Civil-military relations during President William J. Clinton's administration are often credited as being the least harmonious of any American president. It was frequently asserted that civil-military relations during the Clinton administration became so strained and mired in conflict that civilian control of the military had reached a point of "crisis." These claims were frequently substantiated with allegations that the military had become increasingly alienated from the society which it is to serve and protect. Many cited that the military had abandoned its political neutrality and became actively involved in partisan politics. Most significant were claims that the senior military leadership had become increasingly influential in dictating national policies. These elements seemed to indicate that there was a fundamental change within civil-military relations and that the civilian leadership was leading an insubordinate military.

The ability and willingness for the military to render political opposition against its civilian masters, act contemptuously against the president, or dictate national policy certainly calls into question the effectiveness of civilian control over the military. Though it may be tempting to regard this loss of civilian control as a result of military animosity against Clinton, the issue was much more complex. While clashing personalities undoubtedly were a factor, the problem was more deeply rooted.

This monograph poses the question of how did civil-military relations change prior to and during the Clinton administration to convince many observers that American civilian control had declined to a point of crisis? This monograph argues that the primary cause for the perceived decline in civilian control during the Clinton administration was the absence of relevant civil-military relation models which addressed the delineation of labor between civilian and military leaders in the post-Cold War environment. In effort to assess why a crisis was observed, this monograph investigates three key factors frequently cited as being the most contentious to the evolving civil-military relation: 1.) a lack of strategic clarity and focus due to the end of the Cold War; 2.) the rise of military institutional competence and influence; and 3.) the personality and leadership of President Clinton.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. President Clinton and the Military

        Civil-military relations[1] during President William J. Clinton's administration are often credited as being the least harmonious of any American president. One historian observed that "no president was as reviled by the professional military--treated with such disrespect, or viewed with such contempt-- as Bill Clinton. Conversely, no administration ever treated the military with more fear and deference on one hand, and indifference and neglect on the other, as the Clinton administration."[2] It was frequently asserted that civil-military relations during the Clinton administration became so strained and mired in conflict that the time-honored American concept of an obedient military silently submitting to civilian supremacy was jeopardized. Many of these observers produced a great deal of alarmist literature citing that civilian control of the military had reached a point of "crisis."[3] These claims were frequently substantiated with allegations that the military had become increasingly alienated from the society which it is to serve and protect. Many cited that the military had abandoned its political neutrality and became actively involved

---

[1] Civil-military relations broadly refer to the relationship between the armed forces of the state and the larger society they serve, as well as the interaction between the nation's civilian and military elites. Civilian control of the military can be defined as the degree to which the civilian leadership can enforce their authority on the military services. (Richard D. Hooker, "Soldiers of the State: Reconsidering American Civil-Military Relations," *Parameters* (Winter 2003-2004): 4) Peter Feaver states that the overarching civil-military challenge is "to reconcile a military strong enough to do anything the civilians ask them to with a military subordinate enough to do only what civilians authorize them to do." See Peter Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *The National Interest* (Spring 1994).

[2] Richard H. Kohn, "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States Today", *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 55 (Summer 2002): 10.

[3] Key articles which observed a decline in civilian control of the military during the Clinton Administration include: Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations", *The National Interest* (Spring 1994) which ideas and concepts were further developed in "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in The United States Today," *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 55, No. 5 (Summer 2002): 8-58 and "Coming Soon: A Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," *World Affairs* (Winter 2008): 69-80; Russell F. Weigley, "The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell," *The Journal of Military History*, Vol. 57, No. 5 (October, 1993): 27-58; Gregory D. Foster, "Failed Expectations: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations in America," *The Brookings Institute* (Fall 1997), www.brookings.edu/articles/19997/fall_defense_foster; Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, ed., *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition* (Washington D.C., Center of Strategic and International Studies, 1995); Ole R. Holsti, "A Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and Civilian Society?: Some Evidence, 1976-96," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Winter, 1998-1999): 5-42; and Thomas E. Ricks, "The Widening Gap Between the Military and Society," *The Atlantic* (July 1997).

in partisan politics. Most significant were claims that the military had become increasingly influential in dictating national policies. These elements seemed to indicate that there was a fundamental change within civil-military relations and that the nation's political leadership was leading an insubordinate military. How did civil-military relations change prior to and during the Clinton administration to convince many observers that American civilian control had declined to a point of crisis?

A Civil-Military "Crisis"?

In the early months of the Clinton administration a proliferation of alarmist literature proclaimed that America was facing an unprecedented crisis in civilian control. Perhaps the most vocal of these alarmists was Richard Kohn, the former chief historian of the Air Force, who argued that civilian control of the military had been steadily decaying and had finally succumbed by the time Clinton assumed office. Kohn cites that cumulative political, strategic, and institutional failures contributed to this decline. It must be prefaced that the "crisis camp" never speculated that this perceived decline in civilian control indicated an imminent coup by the armed forces or that the very sanctity of the nation's democratic institutions were threatened. Rather, as Kohn observed: "What I have detected is no conspiracy but repeated efforts on the part of the armed forces to frustrate or evade civilian authority when that opposition seems likely to preclude outcomes the military dislikes."[4] This is a very serious allegation.

The most vexing allegation is that the military had become too immersed in the development of national policy.[5] The "crisis camp" unanimously identify the restructuring of the

---

[4]Richard Kohn, "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in The United States Today," *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 55, No. 5 (Summer 2002): 9.
[5] Richard Kohn states that the real problem of civilian control "is the relative weight or influence of the military in the decisions the government makes, not only in military policy and war, but in foreign, defense, economic, and social policy". See Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations" *The National Interest* (Spring, 1994): 11.

military under the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 (GNA)[6] as the impetus for increased military

participation in the political arena. The perceived strengthened position of the Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) under the GNA, specifically during the tenure of General Colin

Powell, has been the most intensely scrutinized and contested aspect. The "crisis camp" asserts

that the increased authority of the CJCS had resulted in less effective advice to the National

Command Authority (NCA). Consequently, recommendations to the NCA had become narrowly

derived solely on the CJCS's position rather than on an increased range of options that should

emanate from the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS). Quoting "a senior officer involved," Kohn claimed

that General Powell instituted a system of command and control in the Pentagon designed "to

give the NCA no options…to control the discussion by presenting just one approach, which was

the option of his choice."[7] Respected historian Edward Luttwak accused the JCS of conducting a

subversive, bloodless coup against the Pentagon's civilian leadership. Like many of these

alarmist writers, Luttwak singled out General Powell as the primary culprit for the decline in

civil-military relations and the undue presence of military influence in policy making. Luttwak

asserts that

> …the power of decision that our civilian President is supposed to exercise through his appointed
> civilian officials has been seized by an all-military outfit that most Americans have never heard of:
> the…'Joint Staff' that serves the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.[8]

Russell Wiegley, a highly regarded military historian, echoed these sentiments in his writings and

pessimistically concluded that civilian control "faces an uncertain future."[9] Former Secretary of

---

[6]The Goldwater-Nichols Act (GNA) was the most comprehensive defense reorganization package
enacted since the 1947 National Security Act. The GNA was designed to accelerate the unification of the
U.S. armed forces by fundamentally altering the manner in which forces were raised, trained, commanded,
and employed. The GNA impacted virtually all major elements within the Department of Defense. The
GNA is often accredited for increasing cooperation and interoperability among the services, improving
military education, and unifying the national military command structure. See
http://www.jcs.mil/goldwater_nichol_act1986.html for duty and responsibility descriptions for respective
JCS members. For complete text of Goldwater-Nichols Act, see
http://www.ndu.edu/library/goldnich/goldnich.html .

[7]Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: the Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," 11.

[8]Edward Luttwak, "Washington's Biggest Scandal," *Commentary* (May 1994): 31.

the Navy John Lehman criticized the CJCS for not providing the NCA a range of options. He

contends that the only option that is presented to the NCA is a military option which encapsulates

the interests of the armed forces rather than a realistic appraisal of adversarial military

capabilities. Lehman stated that an unforeseen consequence of the GNA overlooked by its

framers was that

> …in their understandable quest for efficiency, the military reformers have consolidated the power previously separated between the Military Departments, disenfranchised the civilian officials of each service, and created autocracy in the Joint Staff and arbitrary power in the person of the Chairman.[10]

While many of these allegations undoubtedly slipped beneath the view of the public,

the well-publicized contempt expressed by many armed service members was indisputable. It

was not surprising that the military harbored suspicion toward their new Commander-in-Chief. In

retrospect, it seemed predictable, perhaps even inevitable, that civil-military relations were going

to be strained for the Clinton administration. The military elite had already held strong

reservations against Clinton since the 1992 campaign in which Clinton's avoidance of the draft, a

written letter expressing his "loathing" for the military[11], and participation in demonstrations

against the Vietnam War while in Britain on a Rhodes scholarship all became widely discussed

topics. The military's presumptions seemed to be validated when Clinton announced his intention

to fulfill campaign promises by abolishing the ban on open homosexual service immediately,

without any study or consultation from his military advisers.[12] Clinton's reputation and proposals

---

[9]Russell F. Weigley, "The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell" *The Journal of Military History*, 57, No.5 (October 1993): 28.

[10]Colin Powell, John Lehman, William Odom, and Richard H. Kohn, "An Exchange on Civil-Military Relations: Comments on Richard Kohn," *The National Interest* (Spring 1994).

[11]On December 3rd, 1969, Bill Clinton wrote a letter to Colonel Eugene Holmes, who had been on Clinton's draft board, expressing his views on the military and the war in Vietnam. At the time of the drafting of the letter, Bill Clinton was in his second year as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University in England and Colonel Holmes was the head of the ROTC program at the University of Arkansas. For complete text of letter, see http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/clinton/etc/draftletter.html

[12]There are contradictory reports that indicate that a "national security aide" was assigned to consult the issue with advisory boards, the JCS, and the Senate Armed Services Committee. See Sidney Blumenthal, *The Clinton Wars* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003), 52-53.

immediately created a chasm between the military and the new administration.[13] What was

surprising, however, was how the military reacted to President Clinton. Never before had service

personnel been as openly contemptuous or hostile in speeches, print, or in person against any

president as toward President Clinton.[14] Clinton was continuously the military's target of scorn

and ridicule. To make conditions worse, much of the publicized vocal hostilities were from

senior officers who, by virtue of their rank and position, were seen as role models for soldiers.[15]

Kohn declared that the cumulative effects of these actions against the president represented "the

---

[13]Clinton proposed other actions that were unpopular with the military. For example, Clinton announced that he intended to freeze military pay even though 20,000 enlisted troops were eligible for food stamps under current pay scale. Clinton had also failed to fill key positions within the Department of Defense even though he had been in office for several weeks. Clinton was also unwilling to get involved in security and foreign policy matters. This was demonstrated by the fact that Clinton only attended three NSC meetings during his first year in office. Such actions indicated that Clinton did not take military issues seriously and that he had little regard for the soldiers' well-being. See Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency: Civil-Military Relations from FDR to George W. Bush*, 333-337.

[14]Richard Kohn presents a catalogue of objectionable behavior and actions directed against President Clinton in his articles "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States," "Coming Soon: A Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," and "Out of Control: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations." Kohn cites that military commanders implemented drastic countermeasures to maintain order and discipline as well as quell the military's contempt towards President Clinton. For example, commanders at all levels incessantly reminded servicemen of their constitutional and legal obligations not to speak derogatorily about the civilian leadership. General Merrill McPeak, the Air Force chief of staff, had to remind senior commanders about "core values, including the principle of a chain of command that runs from the president down to our newest airmen." The Atlantic Fleet commander, concerned about unprofessional behavior by sailors, felt compelled to arrive prior to Clinton's visit on the carrier USS Theodore Roosevelt to ensure that President Clinton received a proper reception. Incidents at the military's academic environment seem to solidify the "crisis camp's" position that civil-military relations were in jeopardy. For example, at the Army's Command and General Staff College, a respected Congressman was "jeered" by the class audience when he "repeatedly lectured officers" about Congress' role and powers. The Congressman was further met by "catcalls" at the mention of President Clinton. At the National War College, an Air Force legal officer, who is currently a three-star Air Force general, earned the top writing prize for his thesis which hypothesized conditions that led to a military coup in the United States (See Charles J. Dunlap, "The Origins of the American Military Coup of 2012," *Parameters* (Winter 1992-93): 2-20. http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/1992/dunlap.htm).

[15]Air Force Major General Harold Campbell called President Clinton a "dope smoking…skirt-chasing…draft-dodging" commander in chief at a banquet in the Netherlands in May 1993. (See Eric Schmitt, "Clinton Facing More Unease about Military," *New York Times*, June 9, 1997, p. 7 and "General to Be Disciplined for Disparaging President," *New York Times*, June 16, 1993, p. 10.) Richard Kohn cites an incident at a military ball in which a local news anchor, playing on the ball's theme, "A Return to Integrity," remarked that he "didn't recognize a dearth of integrity here until he realized that President Clinton was in town." The predominantly military crowd, including 20 general officers, reportedly "went wild" in approving response. Original published article was "Wicked Wit," *New York Post* (11 October 1999): 6.

most open manifestation of defiance and resistance by the American military since the publication of the Newburgh addresses[16] over two centuries earlier."[17]

The ability and willingness for the military to render political opposition against its civilian masters, act contemptuously against the president, dictate national policy, or offer the NCA solely military preferred solutions certainly calls into question the effectiveness of civilian control over the military. Though it may be tempting to regard this loss of civilian control as a result of military animosity against Clinton, the issue was much more complex. While clashing personalities undoubtedly were a factor, the problem was more deeply rooted.[18]

This monograph will argue that civil-military conflict and the perceived decline of civilian control was a result of undefined labor divisions between the military and civilian leaders in the post-Cold War environment. The confusion was largely attributed to the absence of relevant civil-military relation models which addressed the delineation of labor between the military and civilian leadership in the post-Cold War environment. This is not to suggest that civil-military relations during the Cold War were harmonious. However, the drastic institutional restructuring imposed by the GNA and the diminished external threat invalidated previous civil-military relation models which were developed upon Cold War strategies and obsolete political structures and processes. There is no question that civilian-military relations were transforming

---

[16] For background information on the Newburgh Address, see http://www.earlyamerica.com/earlyamerica/milestones/newburgh/text.html

[17]Richard H. Kohn, "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States," 10.

[18] Sydney Blumenthal, who had served as assistant and senior adviser to President Clinton from August 1997 until January 2001, observed that Clinton's assumption of office signaled a remarkable, though tumultuous, transition period for the nation. Blumenthal made the following observation: "Even before the inauguration, the patterns of light and darkness had rolled in. The sharp contrasts were not opposites, but elements of the same dynamic. Personality and freakish accident came into full play, but the President's effort to create a new national consensus was what set the political drama in motion. The paradoxes were unparalleled: an activist president of a new generation elected with 43 percent of the vote; the clear end of not only Republican rule but the Cold War; the obvious anachronism of policy and politics; and the lack of a national emergency that would force change. Almost every incident of Clinton's presidency was perceived as a turning point and provoked an outcry. Even modest proposals were perceived as major tremors, obscure skirmishes hailed as signs of Manichean struggle foreshadowing the

during the Clinton administration. This, however, does not prove that civilian control of the military was necessarily in jeopardy. Rather, what was highly visible and widely reported was the confusion, tension, and conflict between the military and the political leadership as they attempted to reestablish a division of labor in a new strategic environment. This thesis will investigate three key factors frequently cited as being the most contentious to the evolving civil-military relation: 1.) a lack of strategic clarity and focus due to the end of the Cold War; 2.) the rise of military institutional competence and influence; and 3.) the personality and leadership of President Clinton.[19] An evaluation of these three factors will also assist in understanding why the "crisis camp" identified there to be a decline in civilian control of the military during the Clinton administration. In order to evaluate how civil-military relations had evolved by the time Clinton assumed office, it is first necessary to examine how civil-military models and perceptions defined American civil-military relations.

II. Civil-Military Relations and Civilian Control

Determining how well the political leaders can enforce its authority on the military is extremely difficult to qualify or quantify and has yet to be effectively reconciled. An analysis of civil-military relations is typically accomplished by examining the means in which the civilian and military leadership communicate and interact, as well as by examining how the interface between these entities is ordered and structured.[20] However, the empirical domain of civil-military relations is highly encompassing. In order to accurately evaluate civil-military relations one would have to assess all indirect and direct dealings among the public, government institutions, and the military. Such an examination would also have to include all legislative

---

end of days. The President's gestures toward common consent triggered new polarizations." (Sydney Blumenthal, *The Clinton Wars*, 52)

[19] Majority of research material which analyzed civil-military relations during the Clinton administration cite at least one of these factors, or a variant of these factors, as a source of tension or conflict between the civilian and military.

[20]Richard D. Hooker, Jr., "Soldiers of the State: Reconsidering American Civil-Military Relations," *Parameters* (Winter 2003-2004): 4.

discourse and discussion over funding, regulations, and the use of military force. Furthermore, it

would be necessary to assess the complex negotiations between the civil and military elites as

they seek to define and implement national security policy.[21] Such an evaluation would be

exceedingly difficult and highly subjective. However, Michael Desch, Associate Director of the

Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky,

provides a succinct evaluation methodology in which he offers that the best indicator of civilian

control is by determining whose position or preference prevails when the civilian and military

diverge. If the military position prevails, there is a problem in civilian control; if the civilian

position prevails, there is no problem.[22] There are obvious shortcomings to this form of

evaluation.[23] However, Desch's evaluation criterion is in keeping with much of the "crisis

camp's" distinction between "good" and "bad" civilian control.   Therefore, this monograph will

adopt Desch's criterion to evaluate civil-military relations during the Clinton administration.

    The American political tradition relies strongly on the concept and spirit of civilian

control prescribed within the Constitution and through a long tradition of military subordination

to civilian authority. The Constitution clearly establishes civilian control over the military in

which the President, as Commander-in-Chief, commands the Army, Navy and Militia. A second

body of civilians, the Congress, is entrusted with the authority to raise and maintain an Army and

Navy for the Nation's common defense. The dispersed authority between these two civilian

bodies is specifically designed to prevent an accumulation of power, but it fails to delineate where

---

[21]James Burk, "Theories of Democratic Civil-Military Relations," *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 29, No.1 (Fall 2002): 7.

[22]See Michael Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999): 4.

[23]Desch admits that there are four potential problems to this evaluation criterion: First, initial civilian and military positions may be strategic and not reflect real preferences. However, one position will ultimately prevail over the other. Second, parties in dispute may resolve differences and change the position of the other. This outcome does not indicate one side has prevailed unless the issue is the source of recurring civil-military tension. Third, the two sides may compromise. However, if the civilian leadership is forced to bargain with the military, then the civilian leadership does not have control over the

the authority of the Commander-in-Chief ends and where that of Congress begins. Consequently, there is unavoidable conflict as the Executive and Legislative Branches compete over dominion of the military. The military is sworn to defend the Constitution, faithfully obey and execute the orders of the president, and loyally support the government. Even if the military desired to remain politically neutral, it will inexorably be forced to participate in the political arena. One need only look at debates and proceedings over base closures, defense contracts, or budgets to see that the military is inevitably involved within the political process. The military is part of the political system, and civilian groups seek to control it in order to exert influence over national strategy.[24] The inability to divorce the military institution from either government branch suggests that the existence of an apolitical and autonomous military is impossible.

It could be argued that the natural propensity of civil-military relations is that of conflict as opposed to harmony due to the vastly different values, interests, and focus of each respected institute. Conflict within the government is heightened by the fact that there is no clear delineation between the political and military realms. Unquestionably, military elites would prefer to have the autonomy to execute operations with the most limited political intervention and constraints. At the same time, politicians would prefer to maintain closer visibility and direction of the military to ensure that directed policy is being faithfully executed. These contrasting positions have led to moments of considerable tension between the military and the civilian leadership. The problem of where to draw the line between civilian and military affairs is highly contentious and largely conditional.[25] Though the line was redrawn on numerous occasions

---

military. Fourth, those making the analysis have a bias toward an echelon. See Michael Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military*, 5.

[24]Christopher M. Bourne, "Unintended Consequences of the Goldwater-Nichols Act," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Spring 1998): 101.

[25]See Michael Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999); Peter Feaver, *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations;* Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency: Civil-Military Relations From FDR to George W. Bush* (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 2005). These works emphasize the conditional aspects of civil-military relations within the United States.

during the Cold War, it was largely incremental and never radical. This was not the situation when Clinton assumed office. Acknowledged divisions of labor which pre-dated the GNA and relied upon Cold War precepts were no longer justifiable and needed to be redrawn.

Civil-Military Relation Models

Is there or has there ever been a proper division of labor between the civilian and military institutions? Theorists incessantly debate how involved civilian leaders should be in military affairs and how involved military leaders should be in political affairs. These debates have forged civil-military relations models which have helped delineate labor divisions. Samuel Huntington's seminal work, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*, has had the greatest impact on American civil-military relations. This work offered the first modern theory and analysis of American Cold War civil-military relations and was largely influential in establishing labor divisions. However, the applicability of Huntington's theory in the post-Cold War environment is largely debatable. Huntington emphatically asserts that there must be a clear division of labor between the military and the political leaders. The reason for an absolute division of labor is obvious: the professional soldier possesses a skill set that makes him most capable at formulating war strategy. This expertise is profoundly different from that of his civilian masters. Huntington clearly states that the "military profession is expert and limited. Its members have specialized competence within their field and lack that competence outside their field."[26] Central to Huntington's theory is the attempt to reconcile the civil-military paradox: how to address the tension between the desire for civilian control and the need for military security. The primary concern of the state is how to minimize the power of the military and make

---

[26]Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations,* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 70.

civilian control more certain without sacrificing protection against external enemies.[27] At the

time of writing, Huntington's study was remarkably valid and applicable to the existing strategic

environment: the United States was in an unprecedented position in which it possessed a large

standing military force during a period of non-conflict and Soviet aggression.

Huntington's prescription to simultaneously maximize military fighting capability and

ensure military subordination was what he termed "objective control."[28] Central to objective

control is the civilian leadership's willingness to concede all military affairs solely to the military.

According to Huntington, any form of civilian intervention into military affairs can be ruinous for

the state and society because it undermines military professionalism and reduces military

capabilities. In return for the civilians' willingness to respect the "autonomous military

professionalism," the state inherits "a highly professional officer corps [that] stands ready to carry

out the wishes of any civilian group which secures legitimate authority within the state."[29]

However, objective control can only be ensured with a politically neutral military. An apolitical

military is an absolute requirement for it ensures that the military is solely utilized in the state's

interests and never in the military's or a political party's own interests. The military's political

neutrality is assured by maximizing military professionalism and "making [the military] the tool

of the state."[30] Since objective control maximizes military professionalism,[31] the military is

---

[27]Peter Feaver calls this question of balancing military strength with civilian control the "civil-military problematique." See Peter Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 23, Issue 2 (Winter 1996): 149-150.

[28]The opposite of objective control is subjective control. Subjective civilian control is achieved by maximizing the power and authority of civilian groups in relation to the military. According to Huntington, there are three methods in which subjective control can be maintained: civilian control by governmental institution; civilian control by social class; and civilian control by constitutional form. (See Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 80-83)

[29]Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 77.

[30] Ibid., 83.

[31] Huntington cites that the in order for a vocation to be a profession, it must have three key distinguishing characteristics: expertise, responsibility, and corporateness. Expertise is the identification that the professional man has knowledge and skills in significant field of endeavor. Responsibility is the identification that the professional man is a practicing expert, working in a social context, and performing a service which is essential to the functioning of society. Corporateness is that the members of a profession

afforded the authority for self regulation and administration. Professionalism ensures that the

military maintains a high degree of readiness for the state. Huntington's opinion is that objective

control is the ideal method of civilian control because of the benefits to the military, the state, and

society.

Objective control over the military has never existed within the modern United

States.[32] Though facets of it have been realized, there, however, has never been a clean

separation of the military and civilian responsibilities as Huntington prescribed.[33] Nonetheless,

Huntington's theory does create a division of labor within his evaluation of the "military mind."[34]

share a sense of organic unity and consciousness of themselves as a group apart from layman. See
Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 8-18.

[32] Huntington cites that objective control has existed in the United States but it had been the
product of geographical isolation and the international balance of power, which permitted the virtual
elimination of standing forces and the exclusion of the military from political power (pp. 189-190).
According to Huntington, this form of control cannot be attained again without Constitutional amendment
(p. 190). His assessment is that the United States maintains subjective control over its military.
Huntington cites that the U.S. maintains elements of "civilian control by governmental institution" as well
as "civilian control by constitutional form." (see Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 81-82.) Russell
Weigley concurs with Huntington's findings and made the following observation of civilian control: "In
spite of the long tradition of the American military's nearly unquestioning acceptance of civil supremacy
and the apparent hardiness of the tradition as recently as World War II, it may be that Samuel P.
Huntington was correct in his evaluation of the American variety of civilian control of the military as a
subjective civilian control, perilous because of a relative absence of objective institutional safeguards."
(Russell F. Weigley, "The Principle of Civilian Control of the Military: from McClellan to Powell," *The
Journal of Military History* (October 1993): 57)

[33] Russell F. Weigley observed that: "no distinct border between soldier and civilian existed in the
United States before the Civil War, it is that war that an examination of the historic details of American
civil-military tensions and particularly of the testing of the principle of civilian control of the military must
begin." Weigley later asserts that "the ready, uncarping military acceptance of civilian supremacy that thus
characterized the arrival of genuinely professional American military leadership during the Civil War
became the established American tradition of civil-military relations for more than eighty years thereafter."
Weigely also maintains that the military abandoned its "quiet acquiesce" to the political leadership by the
conclusion of World War II. See Russell F. Weigley, "The Principle of Civilian Control of the Military:
from McClellan to Powell," 27-58.

[34] Huntington presents a plethora of subjective evidence in this chapter to validate his argument.
For example, Huntington asserts that the military mind is "disciplined, rigid, logical, and scientific" (60)
and "decidedly pessimistic." (63). The military professional only learns through experience and dedicated
study of history. It is through experience and study that the professional soldier will be better equipped to
apply lessons learned to future engagements (64). The military professional "emphasizes the importance of
force as contrasted with ideological and economic factors." (64) The military professional is not concerned
with policy and should never intervene in this arena because it is beyond his capacity and specialty. (70-72)
Huntington's insistence of the military's unyielding obedience to the state is rather controversial. (73-79)
Elements of Huntington's assessment of the "military mind" continue to be pervasive within the military
and civilian channels. However, whether acknowledged or not, Huntington's evaluation of the military
mind has been largely debunked since the first publication of the *Soldier and the State* if one considers the

He cites that the "intelligence, scope, and imagination of the professional soldier have been compared unfavorably to the intelligence, scope, and imagination of …the politician."[35] This assessment is not intended to be derogatory, but is intended to emphasize that the professional soldier's expertise lies within war fighting and not in policy making. Huntington identifies that it is the responsibility of the civilian leaders to establish the state's political goals from which the military professional must devise the military means to make them realized. Moreover, it is the military's responsibility to "warn the statesmen when his purposes are beyond [the military's] means."[36] In Huntington's analysis, the civilian leaders would concede to the military professional's evaluation because he is identified as having expertise in an area that is beyond the political leader's understanding. In reciprocal fashion, the military concedes that "the superior wisdom of the statesman must be accepted as fact."[37]

Many of today's military professionals would dispute the validity of Huntington's assessment of the "military mind." There are many points within his study that prove very salient and enduring. This, however, is not one of them. Huntington's assessment of the "military mind" is archaic and undoubtedly responsible for perpetuating stereotypes of the professional soldier that are irrelevant, misunderstood, and dangerous. Huntington echoes Carl von Clausewitz's observation that war has "its own grammar, but not its own logic" to emphasize that understanding war requires incessant study and commitment. The study of war is not necessarily myopic. Huntington suggests that "military knowledge also has frontiers on the natural sciences of chemistry, physics, and biology. To understand his trade properly, the officer must have some

---

current professional education of military officers or the aspects of national policy that officers weigh as considerations when developing military plans.

[35]Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 59.

[36]Ibid., 69.

[37]Ibid., 76. This does not abdicate the military professional from his three primary responsibilities to the state: to represent the claims of the military; analyze and report on the implications of alternative courses of state action from the military point of view; and implement state decisions even when they are counter to the military's position. (72)

idea of its relation to these other fields."[38] The study of natural science to enhance war fighting

capability seems logical.[39] According to Huntington, however, the study of politics is irrelevant

because it does not enhance the professional soldier's capacity for combat or war fighting. Just as

the study of war requires tireless devotion, the study of politics requires the same effort.

Huntington asserts that it is "impossible" for one to be equally qualified in both fields.[40]

While Huntington emphasized the inflexible study for the military professional, Morris

Janowitz offered a different perspective. The perspective of the Cold War military, Janowitz

offered in *The Professional Soldier*, was vastly different from that of Huntington. Janowitz

addressed the problem of how the military must organize itself to meet multiple functions of

strategic deterrence, limited warfare, and enlarged politico-military responsibilities within a world

that was at nuclear stalemate. Janowitz maintained that the nuclear stalemate between the United

States and the Soviet Union would force the military to redefine its strategy, doctrine, and

professional concepts. Janowitz observed that the rise of the mass armed force during the Cold

War led to a convergence of the military and civilian institutions and a greater interpretation of

the military and the civilian sectors of society.[41] This was largely influenced by the fact that the

Cold War military reached an unprecedented size. The increased size of the armed forces meant

that the military had become more ideologically, economically, and socially diversified. This

diversity also meant that the military became more representative of the society it served. In

staunch contrast to Huntington's findings, Janowitz's prescribed wider and better integration of

the military institution into society and the political arena in order to counter the Cold War threats

---

[38]Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 14.
[39]For example, consider how physics applies to artillery; biology applies to first aid, etc. These disciplines enable the military professional to be better equipped in executing combat-focused tasks.
[40]Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 70.
[41]Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, viii.

more effectively. Moreover, the political leadership had grown to expect increased military involvement in the national security decision-making process.[42]

Janowitz attacked the perception that the "military mind" is "disciplined, inflexible, and …unequipped for political compromise."[43] He cited how military skills have transformed to a level where they reflected those found within the civilian sector. This transformation was largely due to the military's increased reliance on technology. Technological reliance required soldier skill-sets to evolve, but this evolution also resulted in military specialties becoming more closely resembling those found within the civilian sector. Military commanders also became more managerial and bureaucratic in nature. Janowitz observed that the increased diversity within the ranks required commanders to develop more political orientation in order to convey their goals. The military had also become more involved in public relations. Commanders began to identify an increased need for improved communication skills in order to interact more effectively with civilian leaders and the public.

One of Janowitz's most significant assertions was that the Cold War strategic landscape required military leaders to offer more than military options to problems. Military professionalism and expertise now demands familiarity across all elements of national power. In order to gain familiarity Janowitz stated that military elites must become skilled in managing interpersonal relations, in making strategic decisions, and in negotiating terms in the political arena rather than focusing solely on the performance and execution of technical military tasks. Janowitz clearly supported military professionals being involved in the political process at the highest policy levels. Unlike previous conflicts where military involvement in politics was considered "inappropriate and inadequate for the requirements of a world-wide system of

---

[42]Janowitz, 342.
[43]Ibid., 4. For additional perspective and analysis of the "military mind," see Donald Bletz's *The Role of the Military Professional in U.S. Foreign Policy*, 163-208.

security,"[44] the increased destructive power of modern warfare requires increased political involvement, responsibility, and professional input from the military.[45] One of Janowitz's most significant and pointed assertions was that, due to the possibility of nuclear war, the military must be capable of delivering both strategic deterrence and "limited war" options to its civilian masters.[46]

Like Huntington, Janowitz relied heavily upon the concept of military professionalism[47] as a means to ensure proper civil-military relations. The military sees its political superiors as dedicated men who are prepared to weigh the professional military advice with great care.[48] However, the greatest source of consternation toward the political leadership is the immense difficulty in gaining access to the centralized civilian control structure in order to sufficiently influence political decisions. The military wants to be assured that it has effective access to the seats of national power to ensure their input and professional assessment is heard.

---

[44]Ibid., 14.

[45]Ibid., 14. Janowitz stated that the threat of nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union will result in a dramatic increase of "limited wars." Because of this inevitability, Janowitz maintained that "the solution of international relations becomes less and less attainable by use of force, and each strategic and tactical decision is not merely a matter of military administration, but an index of political intentions and goals." See Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Solder*, 14. For additional analysis and interpretation see Sam Sarkesian, "Political Soldiers: Perspectives on Professionalism in the U.S. Military," *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (May 1972): 239-258.

[46]Arguably, one of Janowitz's most prolific offerings is of transforming the military to a "constabulary force." The constabulary force structure covers the entire spectrum of warfare, from nuclear deterrence to counterinsurgency operations. Such a military transformation would allow the military to be effectively organized for strategic deterrence and limited war. More importantly, it forces military professionals to see beyond simplistic terms as "peacetime" and "wartime." Janowitz does acknowledge that such a transformation does deprive the military "victory" and can potentially "weaken heroic traditions" because police operations of this nature are "less prestigeful and less honorable." (See Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 418-423) The military was employed in such a fashion during Clinton's tenure. Interestingly, many military leaders who opposed non-traditional operations presented arguments which reflected Janowitz's writings.

[47] Janowitz maintains a similar identification of professionalism as Huntington. Janowitz cites: "The officer corps can also be analyzed as a professional group by means of sociological concepts…The professional, as a result of prolonged training, acquires a skill which enables him to render specialized service…But a profession is more than a group with special skill, acquired through intensive training. A professional group develops a sense of group identity and a system of internal administration. Self administration- often supported by state intervention- implies the growth of a body of ethics and standards of performance." See Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 5-6.

[48]Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 367.

Interestingly, twenty-odd years after the publication of *The Professional Soldier*, the Goldwater-Nichols Act arguably seemed to have enabled this.[49]

As invaluable as these works are to the study of civil-military relations, they are predominately focused on the military perspective and its responsibilities toward the state. Despite Huntington's assertion that the "principle focus of civil-military relations is the relation of the officer corps to the state,"[50] a proper examination of civil-military relations must include the civilian's perspective of the military. The civilian leadership undeniably has the Constitutional right and obligation to intervene if they do not approve what the military is doing or if they feel that the military is not dutifully following the prescribed national policies. But can the political leadership intervene too much? In his book *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime*, Eliot Cohen argues that the answer is emphatically "no." Cohen immediately cites that Clausewitz identified the futility in attempting to separate the business of politicians from that of soldiers.[51] The impossibility to separate these two aspects is derived from the following logic: if the role of the military is to fight and win the nation's wars, and "war is merely the continuation of politics by other means," then the division of labor is blurred or even non-existent.

Cohen convincingly argues that military affairs are so deeply interwoven with politics that the successful employment of military forces demands incessant civilian oversight and intervention. This intervention is not limited only to the strategic level. Cohen argues that

---

[49] General Powell noted that the reorganization under Goldwater-Nichols Act "gave the chiefs more clout" than in the past. One of the key gains of the reorganization was that it provided the CJCS unfettered access to the Secretary of Defense and the President. Powell reflected that if he was in support of an idea proposed by any member of the JCS, he was "ready to take them to [Secretary of Defense] Cheney and advocate them as strongly as my own. In this way, [JCS] advice got real consideration, rather than the almost automatic dismissal accorded to the ponderous, toothless consensus reports of the past." (See Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 398-399 and 425) Such access certainly demonstrates that the "effective access to the seats of national power" sought by the military, as Janowitz noted, had been realized through the reorganization under the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

[50] Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 3.

political implications are and should be present at all levels of war.   Therefore, the civilian

leadership has the right and obligation to intervene down to the tactical level if it is so compelled.

Such intervention ensures that the military achieves the desired political objectives and end state.

To challenge Huntington's prescribed division of labor, which he terms the "normal

theory," Cohen presents case studies of four civilian leaders who effectively led their nation

during war: Abraham Lincoln, George Clemenceau, Winston Churchill, and David Ben-Gurion.

These men dismissed the "normal" theory and intervened in military operations and affairs at all

levels with remarkable success. Cohen notes how all four of these civilian leaders incessantly

questioned their generals, offered objections to the military's proposed tactics and strategies,

pressed for more military options, and immersed themselves with military technology

development. According to Cohen, it was not uncommon for these civilian leaders to readily

oppose, overrule, or relieve officers when they were dissatisfied with the military's performance.

Of significance, these men successfully defied Huntington's requirement for professional

expertise as a prerequisite for partaking in military affairs.   Instead their compulsion to intervene

stemmed from the "awareness that the experts might be equally mistaken" in their military

assessments and advisement.[52] Even more importantly, the expertise of the professional soldier is

never assured. The competence of the military leader is not exhibited until he is in war, at which

time he may demonstrate complete incompetence.

Cohen acknowledges that increased civil intrusion will inevitably lead to tumultuous

civil-military relations. There is an undeniable degree of mistrust between the two entities

because of the vastly different cultures, values, and interests they have. Cohen reports that there

is a pervasive Huntington-like division of labor within the military. This perspective is captured

in an officer's comment that "it is inappropriate for civilian leaders to involve themselves in the

---

[51]Eliot Cohen, *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime* (New York:
The Free Press, 2002), 7.

details of military operations."[53] The military leadership understandably clings to Huntington's recommendation for an autonomous military removed from the purview of society, one that is allowed the freedom to run itself. Such an arrangement ensures that the military's preference will prevail on all military matters. The reality is that war is ultimately a part of politics and thereby necessarily mired with civil intrusion.[54]

While the military may readily argue the validity of Clemenceau's claim that "war is too important to be left to the generals," few would contest the importance for political leaders to establish clearly defined wartime objectives.[55] One of the common themes from Cohen's case studies is that these leaders had clearly articulated objectives, goals, and policies for the military to follow. Cohen does not confirm whether these policies and objectives were personally formulated by each political leader. In truth, this would matter little. What is important is that each political leader had a grand strategy from which the military leaders could formulate their own strategic and operational plans.[56] This suggests that a shared operational and strategic vision

---

[52]Ibid., 211.

[53]Ibid., 13.

[54] The military has traditionally failed to recognize why war and politics remain inseparable. The military largely upheld that there was a clear line of debarkation where politics ended and war began. Donald F. Bletz offers the following example from World War II to highlight how many senior officers were unable to accept that politics is a continuum during conflict: "One day an American major general asked me: 'Will you please tell me what in hell the State Department is doing in an active theatre of war?' He (the general) was asking for information, so this is in effect what I told him. 'War is a projection of policy when other means fail. The State Department is responsible for foreign policy…The State Department had direct responsibility in the preparatory state leading to the invasion. It was directly concerned in the political decisions, and it will have to deal with the postwar political effects of this campaign.'" (Quoted in Donald F. Bletz, *The Role of the Military Professional in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), 33.)   Such delineation of responsibilities between the military and civilian was also espoused by key political leaders. For example, just days before the attack at Pearl Harbor, when war seemed inevitable, Secretary of State Cordell Hull said to Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson: "I have washed my hands of it and it is now in the hands of you and [Secretary of Navy] Knox – the Army and Navy." (quoted in Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 317) This clearly indicates that political leaders likewise saw a definitive point where politics ended and war began.

[55]Eliot Cohen, *Supreme Command*, 30.

[56] An obvious shortfall of Cohen's analysis is that he fails to account how the military responds if the President fails to provide a grand strategy. One key assumption to Cohen's argument is that the civilian leaders have a grand strategy from which the military develops its own strategy. While Cohen effectively argues that the civilian leadership is entitled to intervene at any level of military affairs, it is under the presupposition that the civilian leaders have provided the necessary guidance to the military. Cohen's case studies persuasively demonstrate that the civilian leadership can provide invaluable oversight and input to

reduces friction between the military and the civilian authorities. Friction is further reduced, though not entirely eliminated, when the political leaders demonstrate that they respect and value the input of the military leaders. Even if the politicians dismiss the military's advisement, civil-military relations should remain favorable as long as the military is afforded an opportunity to render its professional expertise and analysis.

Cohen illustrates that political bosses have intruded within all military operational levels with varying degrees of success. The decision to intrude deeply into military affairs has great potential to spoil civil-military relations because the military is intrinsically averse to excessive civilian intrusion.[57]   The willingness of the military to allow intrusive monitoring is dependent on the civilian leadership. The leaders examined by Cohen were able to intrude deeper into what Huntington would deem military affairs because they possessed remarkable leadership skills, charisma, and personality which resonated favorably with the military. Within the United States, the president's authority as the commander-in-chief authorizes civilian intervention at any level he chooses. However, in Huntington's eyes, the political leader who opts to intrude deeply into military affairs assumes great risk at jeopardizing civil-military relations. Cohen argues that political leaders do and should immerse themselves in military affairs despite resistance from the military. If the civilian leadership is viewed positively by the military, civil-military relations need not be jeopardized.

---

military operations. The civilian leaders from Cohen's study, however, were providing oversight to a strategy which they already endorsed.

[57] Charles Longley, a former political science professor at Bucknell University, created a model to examine the hypothesis that when civilian control is increased, the military becomes more critical and less supportive of their civilian superiors. Using both objective and subjective data, Longley examined the relationship between Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and the service heads on the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1961 to 1967. To analyze this relationship, Longley used three factors: how active McNamara was in his secretarial role as departmental spokesman and policymaker; the decision-making techniques employed; and the number, role, and decision-making authority of McNamara's civilian advisers. See Charles H. Longley, "McNamara and Military Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 18, No.1, (February, 1974): 1-21.

What is particularly commendable about Cohen's analysis is how personality, character, and reputation of the civilian leadership are factored. While the military is legally and professionally obligated to follow the orders of their appointed leaders, how important is the commander-in-chief's character and personality to the military? If an administration is characterized as being trustworthy, respectful to military values, and providing positive leadership, would the military be more receptive to increased civilian oversight and intrusion? Moreover, if an administration possesses these qualities, would the civilian leadership be more or less inclined to allow military participation in policymaking? In his book *The Pentagon and the Presidency: Civil-Military Relations from FDR to George W. Bush*, Dale Herspring, a distinguished political scientist, examines these questions.

Herspring's premise is that the greater the degree to which presidential leadership style coincides with and respects prevailing military culture, the less will be the degree of civil-military conflict. Similarly, the greater the degree to which the presidential leadership style diverges from the prevailing military culture or fails to provide appropriate leadership, the greater the probability and intensity of civil-military conflict.[58] Herspring convincingly proposes that the military prefers a presidential leadership style that is not dissimilar from that found within the military society. The desire for such leadership is evident: there is little deviation from the decision-making style and structure with which the military is familiar.

Herspring's work is not a civil-military model, per se. Rather it is a method to analyze and predict conflict between the military and civilian leaders. Herspring immediately dismisses Huntington's notion that the military is an apolitical entity. Herspring echoes Janowitz's observation that the military is a "bureaucratic organization" which is closely tied to members in Congress and interest groups. These relations have essentially made any civil-military relation

---

[58]Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency: Civil-Military Relations from FDR to George W. Bush* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005), 2.

models which insist upon an apolitical military to be obsolete. The military's political reality has produced a new concept of "subordination to civilian control." [59] Herspring does not imply that the military defies orders issued by the president with which it does not agree.[60] Nor does this evolved civil-military relation concept mean that the military perceives itself to be on equal footing with its civilian masters. The military genuinely respects and honors its subordination to the political leadership. However, the military is now better able to voice objections to Congress and the public over presidential strategies it may be grudgingly obliged to execute. These channels empower the military to have a stronger voice and greater influence over national policies. This increased accessibility also means that the president becomes much more susceptible to open criticism from the military, Congress, and the public. In the age of instantaneous and constant media coverage, in which Clinton was one of its first presidents, there is an increased risk that any form of criticism will be magnified and exaggerated through media channels.

These models and theories demonstrate that much has changed since Huntington first presented his idealistic concept of military autonomy and the absence of civilian intervention into military affairs. As will be explained, the Clinton-era military had long since abandoned Huntington's demand for political neutrality. Instead, the military necessarily immersed itself in the policy making process. Huntington's presupposition that the political leadership will not be

---

[59]Ibid., 1-2. Herspring cites that the point of departure from previous civil-military relation models occurred during the Truman administration. During the Truman presidency, senior military leaders began to look increasingly toward Congress and the media as a means to counter presidential influence over strategy and service issues. These actions, according to Herspring, make the military a politically active entity.

[60] Though the military may not defy orders, it has been accused of "dragging its heels" on several occasions. For example, it is well documented that the Army had intentionally ignored President Truman's directive for racial integration. President Truman had "instructed the Secretary of Defense to take steps to have the remaining instances remaining of discrimination in the armed forces eliminated as rapidly as possible. The personnel policies and practices of all the Services in this regard will be made consistent." Although change was imminent, Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall commented that the army would continue to follow the recommendations of the Gillem Board. The Gillem Board recommendation allowed black battalions to be placed within white Divisions, but not blacks soldiers within the ranks of white units. See Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency*, 69.

involved in military decisions due to their lack of expertise had been debunked by Cohen who

convincingly presented that political bosses can and will inject their influence in military affairs,

albeit with varying degrees of success. The depth to which politicians delve into military affairs

remains largely conditional. Herspring cites that a president's leadership and character determine

how willing he may be to engage in military affairs. The military's acceptance of an increased

level of civilian intervention is contingent upon their trust and confidence in the president's

leadership qualities and respect for the military culture. Unfortunately, President Clinton entered

office during an unpredictable time in which his vision, leadership style, and character were not

what the military needed or wanted to forge a new direction.

III. Clinton and the Post-Cold War Military

A. Lack of Strategic Clarity and Focus

It had been observed that U.S. national policy became "drift and inconsistent" for

several years after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War.[61] The collapse of the

Communist threat created a challenge for civilian and military leaders because their Cold War

calculations for strategic planning were no longer valid. Forging a new national security policy in

light of such drastic transformation of threat conditions would appear to be a priority. However,

just as his predecessor George H. W. Bush had done, Clinton did not clearly define what role the

United States would have in the world early in his presidency.[62] The lack of a National Security

---

[61]A.J. Bacevich, "Civilian Control: A Useful Fiction," *Joint Force Quarterly* (Autumn/Winter, 1994-1995): 79.

[62]Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr. notes that neither President Bush nor President Clinton had submitted comprehensive national security strategy reports to Congress as mandated by the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Congress, however, has also failed to "insist that the president produce national security strategy reports that are as comprehensive and specific as the act requires." (See Lovelace, "Unification of the United States Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act," v-vi). When the GNA was enacted, it was expected that the president would provide comprehensive discussion and description of the following: the worldwide interests, goals, and objectives of the U.S. that are vital to the national security of the U.S.; the foreign policy, worldwide commitments, and national defense capabilities of the U.S. necessary to deter aggression and to implement the national security strategy of the U.S.; the proposed short-term and long-term uses of the political, economic, military, and other elements of national power to

Strategy (NSS) until July 1994, some eighteen months after assuming office, prevented the

military from formulating a supporting National Military Strategy (NMS) that sufficiently

reflected Clinton's vision.[63]

The NSS was originally intended to be a descriptive and comprehensive document.

This has frequently not been the case. The NSS is an essential document for the CJCS to develop

the NMS. The CJCS can develop his strategy in any level of detail he desires so long that it does

not contradict any of the guidance contained in the NSS. The more general the NSS, the more

flexibility the CJCS has in creating the NMS.[64] The NSS generally describes what is to be

accomplished, and to some extent how to accomplish the goals, but is not sufficient to translate

general policy into executable strategy. Since the NSS is ambiguous and not prescriptive, it is

fair to conclude that that the NSS would not inhibit the CJCS from developing strategic plans.[65]

Therefore, it is unfair for the "crisis camp" to accuse the military, specifically the CJCS, for

overstepping its authority by developing national strategy. President Clinton's unwillingness or

---

protect or promote the interests and achieve the goals and objectives of the U.S.; the adequacy of the
capabilities of the U.S. to carry out the national security strategy, including an evaluation of the balance
among the capabilities of all elements of the national power to support the implementation of the national
security strategy; and, such other information as may be necessary to help inform Congress on matters
relating to the nationals security strategy of the U.S. Presidents have not fulfilled this requirement to the
standard that was expected. The NSS is to be submitted annually by the President and within not less than
150 days upon assuming office for a new president. (See http://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL34505.pdf pp.2-
7) However, Congress has also failed to "insist that the president produce national security strategy reports
that are as comprehensive and specific as the act requires."

[63] Don M. Snider offered that the lack of a published strategy reflected a lack of consensus within
the Clinton administration and the inherent difficulty in formulating a new grand strategy. Snider
commented: "This is not to imply that the administration had not given much thought and discussion to
various aspects of an overall security strategy…By one official's count, the National Security Strategy went
through 21 drafts [by the time it was released]…The odyssey of the drafts portrays a lack of guidance and
attention, shifting priorities among too many goals, a series of bureaucratic battles between the departments
of Defense and State…,constant intrusions from the realities of foreign affairs beyond the anticipation for
the administration…There are more fundamental reasons for the lengthy and arduous process through
which the Clinton administration persevered to produce their view of the world and America's role in it.
First, it took a long time for the administration to settle on a set of principles from which to design and
implement a consistent foreign policy. Second, it remains to be seen how strongly the President believes in,
and how consistently he will act on, those principles outlined in his new report." (See Don M. Snider, "The
National Security Strategy: Documenting Strategic Vision," pp.10-13.
http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub332.pdf)

[64] Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr. and Thomas Durell Young, "U.S. Department of Defense Strategic
Planning: The Mission Nexus," Strategic Studies Institute (September, 1995): 6.

inability to provide timely and sufficient strategic guidance, as required by the GNA, compelled the services to implement force structure, roles, and missions based on their own analysis. This, however, was not the first such incident in which the military was responsible for developing national policy. One of the most significant occurrences was the development of the Victory Plan during the initial months of World War II.[66] The Victory Plan was developed by Major Alfred Wedemeyer in which he was responsible for making recommendations on how to mobilize the American industry for war; how to build the size of the armed forces while maintaining sufficient manpower for war-time production; and making recommendations on the grand strategy for the entire war effort. By the premise laid out by the "crisis camp" and Huntington, this was clearly beyond the responsibilities and expertise of the professional soldier. However, due to Roosevelt's willingness to redraw the division of labor between the civilian and military echelons, the military was entrusted to craft arguably the most crucial national strategy during the war.

Clinton's aversion to grand strategy can be partially attributed to the fact that Clinton believed that he was to be a domestic policy president. Clinton was not interested or knowledgeable on issues of national or international security.[67] Clinton's initial plan to focus on domestic affairs and to depend upon his national security team for guidance in foreign affairs would prove to be naïve and counterproductive.[68] Unfortunately, Clinton's key national security advisers were not "bureaucratically strong in their respective departments and agencies, lacked practical strategies for the new international politics, and failed to carry themselves with authority

[65] Ibid., 6.

[66] See Charles E. Kirkpatrick, *An Unknown Future and A Doubtful Present: Writing the Victory Plan of 1941* (http://www.ibiblio.org/hyperwar/USA/USA-Victory/USA-Victory-3.html)

[67] Colin S. Gray, *War, Peace, and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History* (New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 2003), 224.

[68] Sidney Blumenthal, *The Clinton Wars*, 60.

vis-à-vis American allies and others."[69] The lack of presence exhibited by Clinton's advisers, coupled with Clinton's inability to provide coherent strategic vision of how the armed services should be used to protect national interests, created a tremendous void.[70] General Powell enthusiastically filled this void: "[I] saw it as my mission to move the armed forces onto a new course, one paralleling what was happening in the world today, not one chained to the previous forty years."[71] Powell, recognizing that the armed forces would be forced to undergo massive reorganization due to new strategic demands, felt that the military should dictate its own terms.[72] The "crisis camp" viewed Powell's initiative as a deliberate overstepping of authority.[73] In order to appreciate the magnitude of Powell's influence, it is important to examine, albeit very briefly, civil-military relations during the Bush administration.

---

[69]Ibid., 60.

[70]When Clinton submitted his first National Security Strategy in 1994, it was met with indifference and resistance. Clinton's NSS, like those of his predecessors, was criticized for being little more than a "restate [of] policies then in effect… [The NSS] seemed more like promotional brochures on administration policy than carefully reasoned documents of national security." In 1994, Senator Strom Thurmond, one of those involved in passing the Goldwater-Nichols Act, complained that the NSS reports "seldom met … expectations." (See http://www.espionageinfo.com/Mo-Ne/National-Security-Strategy-United-States.html). Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr. provides the following explanation for the deliberate ambiguity within the NSS: "Presidential decisions not to fully implement this section of the act are not surprising. First, to the extent the president commits to a specific and comprehensive national security report, he yields flexibility in his ability to negotiate with Congress regarding budgets and programs. Second, the greater the specificity the president provides, the more control he relinquishes to Congress for shaping the resources allocated to support the various elements of national power. Third, the more specific the national security strategy, the more likely it will be invalidated by unforeseen geo-strategic developments. Finally, a very specific strategy, rigidly implemented, could preclude flexible foreign policy development and implementation. It is understandable that the president would seek to preserve his flexibility and minimize his vulnerability to criticism by submitting national security strategy reports that are sufficiently general to preclude invalidation and which provide for latitude in foreign policy." (See Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr., "Unification of the United States Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act," 28)

[71] Colin Powell, *My American Journey* (New York: Ballatine Books, 1995), 436.

[72] Powell observed that "Congress, independent national security think tanks, and self-styled freelance military experts were blanketing the town with proposals. We had to get in front of them if we were to control our own destiny…I was determined to have the Joint Chiefs drive the military strategy train…I wanted to offer something our allies could rally around and give our critics something to shoot at rather than having military reorganization schemes shoved down our throat."   (Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 424)

[73]For example, Richard H. Kohn criticized that General Powell "without any authorization from superiors, developed a set of concepts designed to reconfigure the entire military establishment [and] pushed his vision of a new national strategy." See Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations," *The National Interest* (Spring, 1994): 6.

It has been observed that, from the military's standpoint, "dealing with the Bush administration was largely a very positive experience."[74] Bush possessed a leadership style that resonated favorably with the military. This greatly contributed to harmonious civil-military relations. Richard Kohn, however, characterized the Bush administration as being too heavily influenced by the military on national security decisions.[75] This is an overstatement. Undoubtedly, Bush was highly inclusive with the military. He ensured that the military had representation in almost all decisions.[76] To infer that the military's professional expertise and analysis was implemented as policy simply because it was considered is presumptuous. Bush also clearly preferred well defined divisions of labor. This was best exemplified at the conclusion of the Persian Gulf War in which Bush commented:

> Colin Powell, ever the professional, wisely wanted to be sure that if we had to fight, we would do it right and not take half measures. He sought to ensure that there were sufficient troops for whatever option I wanted, and then the freedom of action to do the job once the political decision had been made. I was determined that our military would have both. I did not want to repeat the problems of the Vietnam War (or numerous wars throughout history), where the political leadership meddled with military operations. I would avoid micromanaging the military.[77]

One of the most over-looked, though obvious, reasons why civil-military relations were so tense in the initial months of the Clinton administration was because Powell was continuing to perform in the same manner in which he did during the Bush administration. Clinton had a leadership style that was vastly different from that of Bush.[78] Consequently, Powell's inability to alter his method of interaction with the new president, coupled with Clinton's unfamiliarity with military culture, yielded tumultuous civil-military relations.[79]

---

[74] Dale Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency*, 330.

[75] Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," 5-6.

[76] Dale Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency*, 329.

[77] George H. W. Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Random House, 1998), 354.

[78] For analysis on the differences between the leadership styles of Presidents Bush and Clinton, see Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency*, Colin L. Powell, *My American Journey*, or Robert Patterson, *Dereliction of Duty*.

[79] General Powell recognized that there would be a degree of turmoil when Clinton assumed office. In a discussion General Powell had with President-elect Clinton, Powell noted: "You know I have spent most of the last twelve years serving Republican Presidents. My fingerprints are all over their

Late in the Bush administration, Powell was highly criticized for the publication of his article, "Why Generals Get Nervous," in the *New York Times*.[80] This article presented Powell's professional opinion of whether U.S. forces should be involved in Bosnia. In the early days of the Clinton administration, Powell published a second article in *Foreign Affairs* which further outlined conditions which should be achieved before employing military forces.[81] To many observers, this was seen as a clear infringement by the military into national policy. This is exaggerated. It was indisputable that the topic of military intervention in Bosnia was highly contentious and widely debated during the presidential campaign. While the "crisis camp" may legitimately question the forum and timing selected by Powell to voice his position, Powell did not overstep his authority or position.[82] It has been alleged that Powell was attempting to usurp

national security policies. But I am a soldier first, and when you take office, you'll have my total loyalty. My term's (as CJCS) is up in September. But if you want me to go earlier, that's fine. Also, sir, anytime I find that I cannot, in good conscience, fully support your administrations' policies because of my past positions, I will let you know. And I'll retire, without making a fuss." (Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 549.)

[80] See Colin Powell, "Why Generals Get Nervous," *New York Times* (8 October, 1992) http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E0CEFD8163BF93BA35753C1A964958260

[81] See Colin Powell, "U.S. Forces: Challenges Ahead," *Foreign Affairs* (Winter, 1992-1993), http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19921201faessay5851/colin-l-powell/u-s-forces-challenges-ahead.html The contents of this article would later be renamed the "Powell Doctrine." The conditions outlined in the Powell Doctrine were derived from the Weinberger Doctrine, named for former Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger, whom worked for as the National Security Adviser. The Weinberger consisted of six criteria that should be achieved before the commitment of U.S. forces. The six criteria are: 1.) The U.S. should not commit forces to combat unless our vital interests are at stake. Our interests include vital interests of our allies. 2.) Should the U.S. decide that it is necessary to commit its forces to combat, we must commit them in sufficient numbers and with sufficient support to win. If we are unwilling to commit the forces and resources necessary to achieve our objectives, or if the objectives are not important enough to that we much achieve it, we should not commit our force. 3.) If we decide to commit forces to combat, we must have clearly defined political objectives. Unless we know precisely what we intend to achieve by fighting and how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives, we cannot formulate or determine the size of forces properly, and therefore we should not commit our forces at all. 4.) The relationship between our objectives and the size, composition and disposition of our forces must be continually reassessed and adjusted as necessary. In the course of a conflict, conditions and objectives inevitably change. When they do, so must our combat requirements. 5.) Before the U.S. government commits combat forces abroad, the U.S. government should have some reasonable assurance of the support of the American people and their elected representatives in the Congress. 6.) The commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort—only after diplomatic, political, economic, and other efforts have been made to protect our vital interests. For complete transcription of the Weinberger Doctrine, see http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/military/force/weinberger.html

[82]Huntington's assertion is that the role of the military professional is to *represent* the claims of military security, *advice* on the implications for military action, and *execute* state decisions. Powell is not exceeding any of Huntington's tenets. It is reasonable to expect that Powell offered the same advice and

power from the civilian leaders by dictating terms under which military forces can be used.[83]   It

was criticized that Powell's position seemed to insinuate that there was a "great reluctance to use

military force unless 'vital' interests were at stake, a precondition which became essentially a

prohibition."[84]   Such a critique is a misreading. What seems more apparent was that Powell was

advocating a Huntington-like division of labor between the civilian and military echelons. Powell

emphasized that it is the civilian leadership's obligation to provide the military with clearly

established national policy, strategic objectives, and an exit strategy when a decision to commit

military forces had been made. In turn, the military would provide the means required, based on

their professional analysis, to ensure the desired end state is realized. The "crisis camp's"

assertion that Powell placed himself squarely within the political arena is unfounded. Powell

does not appear to be advocating any policy, but rather reinforcing Huntington's principle for

unity between "political goals and military means" as a professional soldier.[85]   Many within the

"crisis camp" were convinced that Powell's writings implied an "all or nothing" military

response.[86]   There is no question that these articles reflect Powell's aversion to using the military

maintained the same position during any discussion or argument over the use of military forces with the civilian leadership.

[83]It is understandable why such criticism against Powell was made. The position presented by Powell was entirely at odds from those expressed by the civilian leadership. While General Powell's position was that the military force should only be employed if the nation's vital interests were at stake and decisive victory was assured, key political leaders within the Department of Defense had vastly different views. Secretary of Defense William Perry, like his predecessor Les Aspin, upheld the belief that the military can be used effectively to achieve "limited objectives." Perry noted: "The idea of military force solely as an instrument to achieve a dramatic solution has been obsolete for decades…Where our supreme national interests is at stake, we will use overwhelming force and go it alone if necessary. Where the threat is less, we will be more selective in using force." (Quoted in Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, ed., *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, 131.)

[84] Robert T. Davis, "The Challenge of Adaption: The US Army in the Aftermath of Conflict, 1953-2000," The Long War Series Occasional Paper 27 (March 2008): 81.

[85] Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 68

[86]Russell F. Weigley criticized Powell by commenting: "It is not an assertion of professional military expertise to say, as General Powell, that: 'As soon as [the political leaders] tell me it's limited, it means they do not care whether you achieve a result or not. As soon as they tell me, 'surgical,' I head for the bushes.' Such a assertion cannot possibly be an expression of professional military knowledge, because the military professional must know that historically there have been myriad of employments of limited rather than overwhelming military forces that have achieved the desired objective…It is not an assertion of professional military knowledge to state as General Powell did in his own article in the *Times*, that 'decisive means and results are always to be preferred, even if they are not always possible.' Limited

to attain "limited" objectives. However, these articles are also a call for prudent diplomatic patience. Powell asserts that a military option should be considered only after all elements of national power have been exhausted. If and when all elements of national power fail then, Powell maintains, the military should be utilized in an unequivocal manner.

It has been noted that military officers had grown "frustrated by the failure of civilians to adopt rigorous procedures for defining strategic objectives and allocating resources."[87] By the time Powell published his articles the military had been deployed for operations in Somalia and Haiti, and were inching towards involvement in Bosnia. In all cases, the military were committed under incoherent national policies. As history demonstrates, the employment of forces in the absence of a coherent national policy or objectives was not unique to the Clinton administration. Most senior military leaders in the Clinton-era military had been involved in "limited wars" with "limited objectives" as young officers. Powell, having personally experienced the difficulties of fighting under ambiguous national policy in Vietnam, astutely did not want military forces to get trapped in never ending conflicts or be subject to "mission creep." Powell clearly denounced a distinction between "limited war" school and the "all-out war" school because, for the soldiers' perspective, "such academic niceties are moot."[88] Powell's authority, bestowed by the GNA, provided him a louder voice to oppose Clinton's use of force methodology.[89]

Powell posited that the application of military means can be deduced by a relatively straightforward litmus test: "is the national interest at stake? If the answer is yes, go in, and go in

military force may well be preferable for policy reasons to the employment of force overwhelming enough to offer possibly decisive victory but also posing the risk of expanding an existing conflict by its own very order of magnitude. Bosnia might reasonably be considered to offer the kind of situation where limited force is to be preferred to unlimited." See Russell F. Weigley, "The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell," *Journal of Military History*, special issue 57 (October 1994): 29.

[87] Douglas Johnson and Steven Metz, "American Civil-Military Relations: New Issues, Enduring Problems," 13.

[88] Colin Powell, "U.S. Forces: Challenges Ahead," *Foreign Affairs* (Winter 1992-1993)

to win. Otherwise, stay out."[90] While this deduction may have been applicable within the Cold War, it was difficult to apply in the post-Cold War era. There are several key reasons for this. First, the nation's security, economic, and political interests had changed and had not yet been effectively assessed. Consequently, the civilian leadership was unable to effectively convince the military why peacekeeping operations in Haiti, Somalia, or Bosnia were necessarily securing U.S. national interests.[91] Second, the application of overwhelming force presented within the Powell and Weinberger Doctrine was not readily applicable to peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping operations, or similar low-intensity operations, require a vastly different approach than conventional war. Powell's demand for overwhelming force for all military operations suggests an inability to deviate from a conventional approach to warfare. Most within the military still equated overwhelming force in terms of massing combat capabilities against a hostile nation. Military leaders became quite astute in determining the proper ratio of force needed to overwhelm an adversary. However, Powell's comments seem to indicate that the military had not yet effectively reconciled how much force would be required to achieve success during peacekeeping operations while still avoiding "mission creep." As a result, there was an aversion to "limited" military operations. Lastly, despite Powell's best intentions, it was not in the military's best interest to simply "stay out" of peacekeeping operations. Just as the end of World War II demonstrated, a lack of an external threat inevitably leads to significant budget cuts, downsizing of the military, and mission change. As resources become scarce, the military would presumably have a better chance to secure a larger budget and maintain a larger force by assuming wider roles

---

[89] In reflection of the U.S. military's experience in Vietnam, General Powell "vowed that when our turn came to call the shots, we would not quietly acquiesce in halfhearted warfare for half-baked reason that the American people could not understand or support." See Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 149.

[90] Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 292.

[91] Michael Mandelbaum, former professor at John Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies, noted that "President Clinton's foreign policy, rather than protecting American national interests, has pursued social work worldwide. Three failed interventions in 1993-in Bosnia, in Somalia, and the first try in Haiti- illustrate this dramatically." (Michael Mandelbaum, "Foreign Policy as Social Work," Foreign Affairs (January/February 1996) http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19960101faessay4169/michael-mandelbaum/foreign-policy-as-social-work.html

and responsibilities. Though many in the military were averse to operations other than war, undertaking such operations would ensure that the military remained relevant.

The debates over how the military should be used in the post-Cold War environment highlight how different civilian and military ideas about the use of force have become. Despite the demise of the monolithic Soviet threat, the Powell Doctrine continued to focus the military on external threats. This was not particularly surprising. Huntington notes that a military always sees that "war is always likely and is ultimately inevitable."[92] While Clinton was not naïve to believe that the end of the Cold War diminished all external threats, the decline of the Communist threat provided his administration an opportunity to utilize the military in different capacities. The concept to utilize the military in expanding capacities was not spearheaded by Clinton. Congress had already put forth proposals and projects which were designed to capitalize the military's inherent capabilities. Just prior to Clinton's assumption of office, President Bush had even deployed troops to Somalia for humanitarian operations. However, Clinton wished to expand this role provided the political cost remained low. What ensued was a great debate between the Clinton administration and the military over what roles and missions the armed forces should have.

The military defined its mission in a relatively straightforward manner: "fight and win the nation's wars."[93] A Huntington-like interpretation of this statement is that all military activities must be to enhance the military's war fighting capabilities and readiness. All effort and concentration of the military needs to be towards improving "the management of violence."[94] The Clinton administration adopted a more non-traditional interpretation and saw that the armed

---

[92] Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 65.

[93] Former Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan made the following observation about the role expansion of the Army during the Clinton administration: "We have to strike a balance between training for war and engaging in other activities. I feel that tension. Everyone has to recognize that the ultimate purpose of the army is to fight and win the nation's wars." (Quoted in Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, ed., *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, 81.)

[94] Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 11.

forces should be used for missions other than war. This did not mean that the military was

absolved of its traditional war fighting responsibilities. Clinton's NSS still emphasized the need

for the military to maintain an ability to fight a conventional war in two simultaneous theatres.

This position, however, also held that the military should be deployed world-wide for

peacekeeping or humanitarian aid operations. Domestically, the military should be used for

community assistance by providing health care, disaster relief, job training and education, and

infrastructure improvement.[95] Clinton's vision for the military was highly progressive, but

illusory. The demand for the military to be equally capable at conducting operations across the

full spectrum, from conventional warfare to humanitarian assistance, is what is expected of the

present armed forces. However, equaling Clinton's desire for a well-rounded armed force was his

ambition to dramatically reduce defense spending. Clinton expected the military to do more with

less and ultimately created a "hollow military."[96]

Military resistance against role expansion is largely attributed to military tradition and

institutional norms. Janowitz identified that professional soldiers can be characterized into two

distinct schools: the "absolutist" and the "pragmatist."[97] The absolutist's approach to war is akin

to Huntington's analysis.[98] The absolutist maintains that war is the basis for international

relations and "total victory" is the goal of war. War is seen as a necessary consequence for failed

---

[95]Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, eds. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, 68.

[96] For example see: William W. Kaufman, "Hollow Forces?: Current Issues of U.S. Military Readiness and Effectiveness," *Brookings Review*, Vol. 12 (Fall, 1994); Michael O'Hanlon, "Ready or Not?: Has Clinton Weakened America's Defenses?," http://www.slate.com/id/82762/; Dick Cheney, "Military Goals Will Produce 'Hollow' Force: Criticism of President Clinton's Military Policy," http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_n49_v10/ai_15981024;

[97] Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 264-267. Donald F. Bletz, in *The Role of the Military Professional in U.S. Foreign Policy*, characterized "absolutist" and "pragmatist" schools as "traditional professionalism" and "new professionalism," respectively. (67-70)

[98] As the armed forces became increasingly involved in non-traditional operations during the Clinton administration, Samuel Huntington commented that "the military should not be organized or prepared or trained to perform such roles…All such roles should be spillover uses of the Armed Services which can be performed because the Services possess the organization, training, and equipment that are only maintained to defend the nation." (Quoted in Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, eds. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, 73.)

economic and diplomatic applications. The absolutist approach demands the clearest and most

narrowly defined national objectives. The advice and recommendations rendered by the

absolutist represent a pure military viewpoint, which is in no way diluted by political, economic,

or other considerations. By limiting military elites from rendering solely military expertise to

national problems, the concept of civilian control over the military is enhanced. A distinct

disadvantage to the absolutist perspective is that the recommendation may not be compatible with

other means of national power.

The pragmatist is inclined to see that military means can be effectively used in

conjunction with other elements of national power to achieve a desired political objective. The

pragmatist approach recognizes that total war is not always the most desirable means to attain

national objectives. Consequently, the pragmatist has little objection to military means being

used to achieve limited national objectives.[99] The advantage of pragmatist military

recommendations is that political, economic, and other considerations have already been taken

into account. Therefore, recommendations will most likely be compatible with the overall

national strategy. The most apparent disadvantage is the real possibility of diluting military

professionalism. The military has a lofty expectation to be versed in all elements of national

power while still maintaining core military competency.

Janowitz once speculated if there would be a resurgence of absolutist elements under

the frustration of periods of "no war, no peace" and the impact of Vietnam.[100] There is clear

indication that absolutist elements were dominant during the Clinton-era military. The

publication of the Powell Doctrine and the military's apprehension to humanitarian and

---

[99] Janowitz noted that military leaders, whether of the "absolutist" or "pragmatic" school, tend to place great emphasis on military factors in international politics due to their professional expertise. Because of the tremendous ambiguities in planning military operations, military leaders seek to develop elaborate and specific plans to cover contingencies, and demand that civilians perform the same type of explicit planning. Therefore, the political leader has the responsibility to prevent national objectives from remaining indefinitely ambiguous. See Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 258-277.

[100] Ibid., x.

peacekeeping operations clearly reflect the prominence of absolutist thought among senior

military leaders.[101] However, mission requirements and budget constraints forced the military to

put pragmatist approaches into practice. Many military professionals who espoused an absolutist

mindset had immense difficulty reconciling Clinton's demand for pragmatic approaches to

military operations. This undoubtedly was a significant contributing factor to the civil-military

tensions.

B. The Rise of Military Institutional Competence and Influence

Many within the crisis camp identified the restructuring of the military under the

Goldwater-Nichols Act (GNA) as the most significant reason for the rise of military intervention

within political affairs and the erosion of civilian control. This assertion is somewhat inaccurate.

Dr. William J. Gregor, professor at the U.S. Army's School of Advanced Military Studies, cites

that the military, specifically the Joint Chiefs of Staff and unified commanders, have been

actively involved in the formulation of national military policy and the political arena since the

enactment of the National Security Act of 1947[102] through the present.[103] It is ironic that the

---

[101] This is not to infer that the military unanimously espoused absolutist thought. For example, Admiral Paul David Miller, commander of USACOM, suggested that "America's Armed Services must continue to be a sword for deterrence, crisis response, and war fighting. At the same time, however, they must be a plowshare for peacekeeping, humanitarian aid, and disaster relief. The U.S. military is more than a force for deterrence; it can and should be a force for constructive change at home and abroad." (Quoted in Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, eds. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, (Washington D.C., Center of Strategic and International Studies, 1995), 72.) The 1993 version of *Joint Publication 3-0* positively reflected the assumption of non-traditional missions, or operations other than war (OOTW): "the military instrument of national power is used for purposes other than large scale combat operations usually associated with war. Although these operations are usually conducted outside the United States, they also include military support to U.S. civil authorities." (p. V-1) The change in doctrine reflected an acceptance to mission expansion, whether willing or not, by the military. Moreover, General John Shalikashvili, who replaced General Powell as CJCS, saw great merit in the use of military forces in humanitarian and peacekeeping operations. Shalikashvili commented that "In the [post-Cold War] environment, at once more demanding and more permissive, new, more flexible standards had to be developed for…the selective use of force." (Lyle J. Goldstein, "General John Shalikashvili and the Civil-Military Relations of Peacekeeping," *Armed Forces and Society* (Spring 2000): 387.)

[102] Douglas C. Lovelace Jr. in "Unification of the United States Armed Forces" cites that the National Security Act was formulated from experiences of World War II "which made it clear that future warfare would be increasingly characterized by unified operations and that a centrally coordinated process for providing U.S. military capabilities was needed." (p. 1)

GNA is blamed for the decline of civilian control because the GNA was specifically designed to create clear divisions of labor between civilian and military responsibilities.[104] The GNA intended to supplant service interests and parochialisms and produce a Joint or unified perspective. Such a perspective would, theoretically, improve military advice given to the president, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council (NSC).

Under the GNA, General Powell, as CJCS, assumed a position of influence that surpassed everyone else in the Pentagon except that of the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF).[105] The strengthened position of the CJCS has been subject to much scrutiny. Edward Luttwak referred to the increased power of the CJCS as "the biggest Washington scandal" and that it demonstrates the "collapse of civilian control over the military policies and military strategy of the United States."[106] The "crisis camp" has argued that by making the Chairman the principal military adviser to the president and giving him control of the JCS, the GNA created a de facto national general staff. The "crisis camp" also alleged that the increased quality of officers occupying billets within the JCS enabled the military to gain approval and acceptance of their

---

[103]William J. Gregor, "Toward a Revolution in Civil-Military Affairs: Understanding the United States Military in the Post Cold War World" (p. 20). Dr. Gregor states that there are four essential tasks for the Joint Chiefs of Staff that make it unavoidable for the military to be divorced from political affairs: 1) prepare strategic plans and to provide strategic direction for the forces. 2) Prepare logistic plans and assign logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans. 3) Establish unified commands in strategic areas when it was in the interest of national security. 4) Make recommendations regarding the budget.

[104] One could argue that the GNA was a blatant attempt to institutionally establish a coherent and definable division of labor between the civilian and military. This was, in part, to maximize and preserve military expertise and to ensure political leaders did not supplant military advisement. This was clearly articulated by Senator Barry Goldwater who opened the Senate Armed Services Committees hearings to consider reorganizing the Pentagon in July 1983 with the following statement: "The question is, can we, as a country, any longer afford a 207-year-old concept that in military matters the civilian is supreme? Now, I realize the sanctity of the idea of the civilian being supreme. It is a beautiful thing to think about. The question in my mind is, can we any longer afford to allow the expertise of [professional military] men and women…to be set aside for the decisions of the civilians whose decisions have not been wrapped in war[?] We lost in Korea, no question about that, because we did not let the military leadership exercise military judgment. We lost in Vietnam…If that is the way we are going to do it in the future, I think we are in trouble." Quoted in Christopher Bourne, "Unintended Consequences of the Goldwater-Nichols Act," *JFQ* (Spring 1998): 100.

[105]The GNA allows the CJCS, subject to the direction of the president, to participate in National Security Council meetings. Additionally, the GNA permits the SECDEF to assign overall supervision of

position on critical issues by the NCA and NSC.[107] According to the "crisis camp," the CJCS's

consolidation of power, coupled with the JCS organizational supremacy and influence, enabled

the military to dominate policy development.

These outcries of criticism by the "crisis camp" over the supposed consolidation of

power, influence, and authority by the CJCS lack merit. While the military's position has

prevailed on highly publicized issues such as homosexuals in the military, the military certainly

has not got its way in the post-Cold War era.[108] The "crisis camp" does not clarify whether they

believe that the CJCS was made too powerful or if Powell became too powerful as CJCS. There

is no question that Powell approached his duty as CJCS with less trepidation than his predecessor.

The first CJCS, Admiral William Crowe, commented how he cautiously approached his new

position: "I made a deliberate decision to move gradually in inaugurating the new format. Rather

than baldly asserting my authority, I would allow the chiefs to accommodate to the new bill by

---

certain defense agencies and field activities to the CJCS. Congress, however, took measures to limit CJCS
authority by specifically not vesting him with command authority.

[106]Edward Luttwak, "Washington's Biggest Scandal," *Commentary* (May 1994): 31.

[107] Despite initial opposition to fill congressionally mandated Joint billets, the armed forces began
to occupy positions with high quality officers. The civilian side, however, was lacking. The Commission
on Roles and Mission of the Armed Forces, after examining the quality of civilians within DOD, found that
"political appointees in [the Office of the Secretary of Defense] and in the military department staffs often
lack the experience and expertise in national and military strategy, operations, budgeting, etc. required by
the positions they fill." The short tenure of appointees exasperated the situation. Former Secretary of
Defense Les Aspin reported: "There's been a shift in the quality of people working on the military versus
the civilian side. Because of Goldwater-Nichols, the quality on the military side has gone up tremendously,
where the reverse has happened on the civilian side. Revolving-door restrictions have made government
service so unattractive that the pool from which you can pick political appointees is not as rich as it once
was." (Quoted in Christopher M. Bourne, "Unintended Consequences of the Goldwater-Nichols Act," *JFQ*
(Spring 1998): 103.)

[108]Michael Desch catalogued key issues which the military and civilian leaders argued over in the
post-Cold War period. His findings are that of the twelve highly publicized issues (which include Gulf
War strategy, gays in the military, commitment of armed force in Haiti, and combat restriction on women)
the military's position prevailed seven times, the civilian position four times, and mixed response one time.
See Michael Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military*, p. 31 and p. 138. The fact that the military's position
has not always prevailed is clearly obvious by the execution of operations under policies that it does not
entirely agree on in a manner which it is adverse to (i.e. "mission creep"). Despite its protests, the military
ultimately performed peacekeeping operations in Somalia, Haiti, Kosovo and Bosnia during the Clinton
administration in the manner prescribed by the administration.

degrees."[109] Crowe had laid a foundation as CJCS which Powell would benefit from. Powell had

every intention of exploiting every limit within his authority as CJCS. The "crisis camp" equates

Powell's assuredness as a usurpation of civilian power.

This flawed observation stems from the "crisis camp's" inability to recognize that JCS

relationships with the president and NSC are conditional. As discussed, civil-military relations

during the George H. W. Bush administration were highly favorable due to the Bush's

willingness to allow the military to operate with greater autonomy. Bush entrusted the military to

rethink post-Cold War requirements for strategy and restructure of the military force. The

President's willingness to entrust the military with this critical task does not indicate a lapse of

civilian control. One of the most misinformed accusations from within the "crisis camp" was that

General Powell "without any authorization from superiors, developed a set of concepts designed

to reconfigure the entire military establishment [and] pushed his vision of a new national

strategy."[110] The GNA specifically requires the CJCS to do exactly that.[111] The fact that

Powell's assessment and recommendations were approved by the SECDEF and Bush does not

indicate military domination within national policy development.

The "crisis camp" seems to identify a Commander-in-Chief heeding to the military's

recommendations as a lapse of civilian control. In response to criticism, Powell stated that "of all

the problems facing the nation, a crisis in civil-military relations is not one of them and things are

not out of control…both Presidents Bush and Clinton expressed satisfaction with the manner in

which I provided my advice."[112] Kohn and Luttwak countered Powell's statement by citing that

this very harmony proves the existence of a crisis. The "crisis camp" seems to believe that civil-

---

[109] Quoted in Peter J. Roman and David W. Tarr, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff: From Service
Parochialism to Jointness," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 113, No. 1 (Spring, 1998): 102-103.
  [110] Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations," 6.
  [111] See Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, Section 153 for
the responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
http://www.jcs.mil/goldwater_nichol_act1986.html

military relations must be plagued by conflict and open disagreement in order for there to be

indication that civilian control is not compromised. Interestingly, Samuel Huntington made the

same criticism against Roosevelt for readily accepting recommendations from his military

advisors over his civilian advisors during World War II.[113] Huntington expressed that

> Too much harmony is just as much a symptom of bad organizations as too much conflict. On
> the face of it, something is wrong with a system in which, during the course of a four-year war,
> the political Chief Executive only twice overrules his professional military advisors. This can
> only mean that one of them was neglecting his proper function and duplicating the work of the
> other.[114]

Huntington and the "crisis camp" have an ill-founded assumption that the military and civilian

leaders have disparate views on national policy. The most logical reason why Roosevelt, like

Bush, endorsed the military's position is because it reflected his perspective and supported his

strategy. More importantly, it is presumptuous to conclude that the military is solely providing or

capable of providing military options.

It appears as though the "crisis camp" cannot accept how politicized the military has

become.[115] This is not to suggest that the military is playing partisan politics. However, the

---

[112]Colin Powell, John Lehman, William Odom, and Richard H. Kohn, "An Exchange on Civil-Military Relations: Comments on Richard Kohn," *The National Interest* (Spring 1994): 23.

[113] Donald Bletz cites that President Roosevelt "overruled the opinions of his military chiefs on only two occasions during the entire war- in July 1942, on the North African invasion and in December 1943, on the question of a projected operation in Burma and the Bay of Bengal. There were, of course, other occasions on which the Joint Staff did not present a unanimous recommendation to the president and Roosevelt was compelled to select one choice among several." See Donald Bletz, *The Role of the Military Professional*, 32.

[114]Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 329. Huntington continues to explain this lack of conflict by offering: "The acquiescence of the military was in part the result of daily contact with the President and his appealing persuasiveness. But it was even more due to the fact that as the Joint Chiefs became the alter egos of the President in the conduct of the war it was only natural that similar responsibilities and similar perspectives should produce similar policies." (Huntington, 333.)

[115]Sam C. Sarkesian identified in 1972, just prior to the military's conversion to an all-volunteer force, that the political dimension of the military needed to be recognized if the military was to serve national security goals and if effective civilian control was to be maintained. Sarkesian predicted that the military would be more politically active; disregard orders from civilian institutions which do not account for military interests; and become much more active in political processes to further its own goals. Sarkesian pointed out that traditional military professionalism would not change. However, "professionalism must now incorporate considerations of political skills as part of the individual role and political effectiveness as part of institutional patterns." See Sam C. Sarkesian, "Political Soldiers: Perspectives on Professionalism in the U.S. Military," *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 16, No.2 (May, 1972): 239-258.

military has become much more astute at utilizing political channels to further their positions.[116]

Admiral Crowe reflected that "few officers these days made it into the higher ranks without a firm grasp of international relations, congressional politics, and public affairs…The old military was gone."[117] While the military has evolved, the "crisis camp" clings to archaic civil-military relation models and antiquated concepts of military professionalism. Even more outdated is the notion that military elite are only capable of providing military options to national problems.[118]

Much has changed and one would be hard pressed to find a current senior military leader who is solely focused on the military element of national power.

C. The Personality and Leadership of President Clinton

Most American public administration experts contend that it is essential for a democracy to have a military service whose social origins and attitudes are broadly representative of the

---

[116] Deborah Avant cites that the different electoral structures for the president and Congress encourage disagreement between the institutions over policy goals. When Congress wants the military to do one thing and the president another, the military is likely to align with the civilian preferences closest to its own. When civilians disagree, the military has an incentive to act strategically and play civilians off one another in order to gain support for its own preferences. All things being equal, military options are more influential when civilians disagree on policy. See Vincent Davis, ed., "Civil-Military Relations and the Not-Quite Wars of the Present and Future," Strategic Studies Institute (October, 1996): 21.

[117] Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations," *The National Interest* (Spring, 1994): 9. Interestingly, Adm. Crowe received considerable criticism for actively campaigning for Clinton during the 1992 election. Though Crowe was retired at the time, many called into question the appropriateness of his actions. The level of criticism against Crowe exponentially increased when Clinton appointed him Ambassador to the United Kingdom after assuming office.

[118] Remarks by former JCS illustrate how the boundaries of military expertise have progressively expanded. For example, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, when testifying before the Senate in June, 1947 said: "I appear before you only as a professional soldier, to give you a soldier's advice regarding the national defense. I am not qualified to proceed beyond that field; and I do not intend to do so." (Quoted in Donald F. Bletz, *The Role of the Military Professional in U.S. Foreign Policy*, 45.) In July, 1955 General Matthew B. Ridgeway, former Chief of Staff of the Army, stated: "I view the advisory role of a member of the JCS as follows: He should give competent professional advice on the military aspects of the problems referred to him…He should confine his advice to the essentially military aspects." (Bletz, 52-53). These men support the position that the military professional should only provide purely military advice and that the responsibility rests within the political leadership to place this advice in the proper perspective. However, later JCS held vastly different perspectives than Eisenhower and Ridgeway. For example, General Maxwell D. Taylor, in February 1964, stated: "I do not share the view that each advisor should be a specialist bringing to the table a narrow specialized view of the problem derived from the interests of the agency of the government which he represents." (Bletz, 60)

society at large.[119] However, former Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Stanley R. Arthur, emphatically stated that "the armed forces are no longer representative of the people they serve. More and more, enlisted as well as officers are beginning to feel that they are special, better then the society they serve. This is not healthy in an armed force serving a democracy."[120] Many within the "crisis camp" echoed this sentiment and identified it as a critical reason for the decline of civil-military relations.

The observation that the military is no longer representative of the society it serves is largely factual. The military has never sufficiently reflected the racial, educational, or socio-economic demographics of society. Since the end of the conscript force, the military has, with good reason, established enlistment and commissioning criteria that inevitably prevent many from joining the ranks.[121] The selection criteria became even more selective after the Cold War. The downsizing of the military that was initiated during the Bush administration meant that a higher caliber of soldiers and officers remained. More importantly, since the military required lower troop levels, there was a relatively larger pool of potential recruits. The military could recruit individuals of higher quality and afford to be more selective. Though the military took great measure to have a fair representation of all races, ethnicities, creeds, it was unable to do the same with political party affiliation. Most military personnel identify themselves as Republican and as espousing conservative values.[122]

Janowitz stated that a "civil or military service whose political beliefs were widely at variance with those of the electorate would present a danger to political democracy, for such a

---

[119] Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 253.

[120] Vincent David, ed., "Civil-Military Relations and the Not-Quite Wars of the Present and Future," 15.

[121] For analysis of the post-conscript military, see Richard V.L. Cooper, "The All-Volunteer Force: Five Years Later," *International Security* (Spring 1973): 101-131.
http://www.jstor.org.stable/2538460

[122] For example, see Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, 93-94; Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 236-243; Ole R. Holsti, "A Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and Civilian Society?: Some Evidence, 1976-1996," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Winter, 1998-1999): 5-42.

service could not be counted on to remain loyal to the concept of political neutrality."[123] This has

not proven true. Every administration, whether Democratic or Republican, has suffered through

episodes of civil-military tension. Though some members of the "crisis camp" pointed out the

over-representation of Republicans as a factor, there does not appear to be any correlation

between the military's political party affiliation to civil-military friction during the Clinton

administration. The military has long been identified as being a conservative minded institution

which jealously guards its traditions and values.[124] This does not suggest that the military's

traditions and values have not evolved. The military has often been at the fore, whether willingly

or not, of many critical and contentious social initiatives, the most noteworthy being racial

integration. In every such case, the military had adapted, evolved, and transformed to better

reflect the society it serves. This adaptation, however, is slow. When Clinton attempted to lift

the ban on homosexuals, the military's resistance stemmed more from the desire to preserve its

culture and values as opposed to bigotry. Such a policy change was simply deemed too drastic by

Powell and the JCS and was defended as such.[125] As Powell explained: "I have no brief against

any group of Americans, but I represent an institution that changes very slowly and with great

reluctance. I'm doing my best to make it change as fast as I think it effectively can."[126]

Ultimately the senior military leadership deemed that Clinton's social initiative was irreconcilable

with the current military culture and would diminish war fighting effectiveness. Despite the

"crisis camp's" analysis of the military's opposition as being open defiance against its civilian

---

[123] Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*, 253.

[124] For example, see assessments made by Samuel Huntington in *The Soldier and the State*, Morris Janowitz in *The Professional Soldier*, S.E. Finer in *The Man on Horseback*, or Charles Moskos analysis in his essay "The Military."

[125]Powell provided the following account of the discussion between the JCS and President Clinton over gays serving in the military: "[Powell] suggested that the President hear from each chief from the perspective of his service, since they were the ones who would have to make any new policy work. The chiefs spoke in turn, making clear that they were not just voicing personal opinions; they were concerned about maintaining morale and good order. They had gone back to their constituencies- the commanders, senior NCOs, the troops, service spouses, chaplains- and they had run into a solid wall of opposition to lifting the ban." Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 556.

[126] Quoted in Richard H. Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," 9.

masters, the military was fulfilling its obligation to advise the NCA on potential readiness issues as prescribed by the GNA.[127]

Arthur's assertion that the military perceives itself to be "better than the society they serve"[128] is unsubstantiated. While there have been some widely circulated articles that attempted to support this indictment, they were supported largely by anecdotal evidence.[129] If the military thought that it was better than the society it serves, then one would logically expect there to be decreased public confidence in the military. However, this was not the case.[130] Public support for the military was higher than any other government institution even throughout the "crisis" period. The military, however, clearly lacked confidence in Clinton's ability to be an effective commander-in-chief. After one year in office, interviews and polls with officers, enlisted personnel, and veterans identified five areas of concern with the new president: Clinton's avoidance of the Vietnam War; Clinton's attempt to lift the ban on homosexuals; fears about Clinton's scheme to cut the defense budget; resentment over a Clinton administration proposal to freeze military pay; and the "prevalent view that Mr. Clinton and his staff neither understand military life nor like military people."[131] What is interesting is that the military's concerns reflected a dogged willingness to defend its culture from attacks by the Clinton administration. The military's perception was that "military people" were vastly different from the civilian

---

[127] General Powell commented: "I stand by what I have done. My position reflected my conscience and the needs of the service at the time. I say this realizing that, as time passes, public attitudes may change on this volatile subject just as they have on so many burning social controversies in recent years." Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 559.

[128] Vincent David, ed., "Civil-Military Relations and the Not-Quite Wars of the Present and Future," 15.

[129] See Ole R. Holsti, "A Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and Civilian Society?: Some Evidence, 1976-1996," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Winter, 1998-1999): 5-42. http://www.jstor.org/sici?sici=01622889(199824%2F199924)23%3A3%3C5%3AAWGBTU%3E2.0.CO% 3B2-5&cookieSet=1 and Thomas E. Ricks, "The Widening Gap Between the Military and Society," *The Atlantic* (July 1997) http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/97jul/milisoc.htm.

[130] According to 1993 Gallup polls, the armed forces ranked highest among all government institutions for public confidence. The armed forces have consistently ranked highest among all government institutions in all Gallup polls conducted through 2008.

leadership. Many within the military maintained that Clinton and the preponderance of his staff

could not understand and appreciate military culture or the sacrifices of the armed forces because

they had never been in the ranks. Consequently, many service members noted that the political

leaders were incapable of identifying problems that would ensue by lifting the ban on

homosexuals. Moreover, service members saw that Clinton demonstrated a clear lack of respect

for the military's function and well-being by cutting the defense budget and freezing military pay.

The fallout of these actions was that the military became inclined to see their relationship with the

Clinton administration as "us" versus "them." Unfortunately, this is a very misguided perception.

The divide between the military and the administration can be attributed in part to Clinton

being the first president to enter office without military service in over fifty years. Though

military service is no requirement to be president, there had been a time-honored tradition that

those seeking the nation's high office have once defended it.[132] Though there is no correlation

between military service and good presidential performance, service members tend to prefer to

have a commander-in-chief with prior military service. Clinton's lack of military service

certainly was not an anomaly among "baby boomers," though he was the first president since

Herbert Hoover to have no military background.[133] However, Clinton's avoidance of the draft as

a student abroad and his alleged disdain for the military were unprecedented for one seeking such

high public office. Not only did the new president lack any understanding of the military culture,

---

[131]Mark J. Eitelberg and Roger D. Little, "Influential Elites and the American Military after the Cold War," in *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, ed. Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, (Washington D.C., Center of Strategic and International Studies, 1995), 49.

[132]Clinton was the tenth President to have never served. Roosevelt did not serve in the military though he had been the Assistant Secretary of the Navy during World War I.

[133] Mark J. Eitelberg and Roger D. Little note that the "first hint of a break in the tradition at the national [political] level occurred when it was revealed that David Stockman, President Ronald Reagan's budget wunderkind, had finessed his way out of the Vietnam draft. Former Senator Gary Hart, who once aspired to be president, was vilified by critics over his seeming avoidance of military service…More recently, some have questioned the methods and motives of Dan Quayle, who enlisted in the Indiana National Guard during the Vietnam War; and the explanation given by Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense in the Bush administration, as to why he had never served his nation in uniform." See Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, eds. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, (Washington D.C., Center of Strategic and International Studies, 1995), 36-37.

he had previously voiced his contempt towards the armed services and its involvement in Vietnam.[134] This certainly generated great animosity among senior military leaders who had served in Vietnam. Interestingly, this did not prevent Clinton from winning the election against an incumbent who had military experience. What this demonstrated was that Clinton's lack of military experience or the views he maintained as a graduate student toward an unpopular war were not of critical concern to the majority of the American public. Clinton's emphasis on domestic affairs, plan to cure the ailing national economy, and charisma outweighed his lack of military experience. With a lack of external threat and domestic agenda, Clinton was the ideal candidate for the majority of voting citizens.

It has been observed that "related to Clinton's energy, enthusiasm, intelligence, and devotion to policy is a cluster of more problematic traits- absence of self discipline; hubristic confidence in his own views and abilities; and difficulty in narrowing his goals, ordering his efforts, and devising strategies for advancing and communicating the ends he seeks to achieve."[135] Such traits are in staunch opposition to the clear, concise, formal leadership style preferred by the military. These traits contributed to Clinton's remarkably poor civil-military relations and inability to gain the trust and confidence from the military.[136]

Clinton's "absence of self discipline" became visible during the presidential campaign and earned him the scorn and ridicule of service members. Clinton's declaration that he had previously smoked marijuana, his lurid reputation as a womanizer, and anti-military views did not resonate well within the military. Perhaps the most infamous lapse of self discipline was the

---

[134] On December 3rd, 1969, Bill Clinton wrote a letter to Colonel Eugene Holmes, who had been on Clinton's draft board, expressing his views on the military and the war in Vietnam. At the time of the drafting of the letter, Bill Clinton was in his second year as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University in England and Colonel Holmes was the head of the ROTC program at the University of Arkansas. For complete text of letter, see http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/clinton/etc/draftletter.html
[135]Fred I. Greenstein, "The Presidential Leadership Style of Bill Clinton: An Early Appraisal," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 108, No. 4 (Winter, 1993-1994): 594.
[136] See http://www.hackworth.com/6sep94.html

Monica Lewinsky scandal.[137] Though this incident occurred late in his second term, many within the military seemed vindicated knowing that their preconceived notions of Clinton's character proved true. Clinton's "hubristic confidence in his own views and abilities" was first seen in his adamant insistence of allowing gays to openly serve within the military and later with his desire to expand the role of servicewomen in combat. Clinton expressed great determination to continue downsizing the military force and reduce the defense spending. Despite diminishing resources, Clinton was equally determined to expand the military's role in peacekeeping operations while still maintaining an ability to fight conventional engagements in two simultaneous theatres. The expectation that the military was capable of accomplishing such a feat was illusory and generated significant readiness issues. Clinton's "difficulty in narrowing his goals, ordering his efforts, and devising strategies for advancing and communicating the ends he seeks to achieve" proved particularly problematic as the military found itself increasingly deployed for operations without clear objectives or exit strategy. In every such instance in which Clinton committed armed forces they became subject to "mission creep" due to poorly devised strategies.[138]

Dale Herspring's hypothesis that the greater the degree to which the presidential leadership style diverges from the prevailing military culture, the greater the probability and

---

[137] The Monica Lewinsky scandal was particularly difficult for the military to reconcile. Many within the military were immensely frustrated with Clinton's irresponsible behavior and lack of public accountability. Officers cited how servicemen were punished under UCMJ and forced to resign or removed from service for such a violation. What was particularly difficult for the military was the obvious double standard that was maintained under the Clinton administration. Shortly before the Lewinsky scandal, Air Force General Joseph Ralston was denied the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and forced to resign for a relationship he had had while separated from his wife (See http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,986544-1,00.html). The common sentiment was that Clinton, as Commander-in-Chief, should endure some form of punishment and accountability just as his military subordinates must. Military leadership principles, after all, are based on not asking a subordinate to do anything that a superior would not do. Clinton's actions violated a core leadership tenet that the military revered. This incident further reduced Clinton's credibility and respect within the military ranks.

[138] John Hillen, a defense analysis at the Heritage Foundation, noted that strategic analysts were starting to refer a "Clinton Doctrine" based on the increased rate of humanitarian relief efforts. The "Clinton Doctrine" is when "calculations of national interest, exit strategies, and military efficacy are replaced by a feel-good reprise of the old political syllogism: Something must be done, this is something, therefore we must do it. Intentions, not results are the leitmotif of this new strategy." See John Hillen, "General Chaos," *National Review* (December 31, 1996): 21.

intensity of civil-military conflict was certainly validated during the Clinton administration.[139] Clinton knew little about the military and made little effort to better understand it. Further complicating the situation was the fact that the Clinton administration had few military veterans who could potentially bridge the divide between the civilian and military.[140] This cultural void made it particularly difficult for the military to overcome difficulties in explaining how to best utilize military forces. Despite this lack of military understanding, the Clinton administration was remarkably willing to commit forces.[141] The issue was not the mission the military was directed to do, but the lack of specified objective the military was to achieve and the lack of resources allocated for the military to train and sustain itself. The military, albeit with varying degrees of endorsement, slowly recognized that it would be increasingly called upon to execute operations other than war. The military had performed humanitarian, peacekeeping, and disaster relief operations during previous administrations, but had done so with explicit national objectives. Clinton's motives to commit forces may have been well-intended. However, Clinton's inability to provide guidance and unwillingness to allocate sufficient resources needed to meet his demands was negligent. While Clinton's desire to curtail human suffering in Somalia, Haiti, Kosovo, and Bosnia demonstrate compassion and an altruistic nature, his decision to commit

---

[139]Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency*, 2.

[140] White House Office of Public Liaison revealed that only 18 percent of men aged 39 to 59 Clinton administration were military veterans. This is quite short when compared to the over 40 percent of men in the same age group in the general population. Of men aged between 39 to 59 working in the Clinton White House, only 8 percent were military veterans. (Quoted in Don M. Snider and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, eds. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition*, (Washington D.C., Center of Strategic and International Studies, 1995), 48-49). This lack of familiarity led to rather embarrassing episodes during the Clinton administration. For example, General Barry McCaffrey, the assistant to the CJCS, greeted a young Clinton aide by saying "Good morning." The aide replied: "I don't talk to the military." See Robert Patterson, *Dereliction of Duty: The Eyewitness Account of How Bill Clinton Compromised America's National Security* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2003), 90.

[141] Powell recounts that there were numerous instances in which he attempted to advise the Clinton administration on the proper employment of forces. Powell emphasized that when military forces were used for peacekeeping, humanitarian, or disaster relief during previous administrations, they operated with explicit national objectives. The chasm between the military and civilian leaders on the proper use of armed forces was perhaps best encapsulated by Secretary of State Madelein Albright: "What's the point of having this superb military that you're always talking about if we can't use it?" See Colin Powell, *My American Journey*, 561.

soldiers under emotional interests rather than national interests was reckless and tragic. Even more damaging was Clinton's willingness to withdraw troops at the slightest hardship as during Somalia and Haiti.[142] Such impulsiveness defied the calculated operational approach embraced and practiced by the military.

It is difficult to determine why there were so many incidents of contemptuous words from within the ranks toward President Clinton. It is understandable why senior military leaders who had served in Vietnam would resent a commander-in-chief who had avoided combat service and previously voiced disdain for the armed forces. However, the behavior of these professional military leaders is inexcusable. At the present time, no one has satisfactorily researched why so many young soldiers, who lacked a first-hand connection to the Vietnam War, harbored so much resentment towards Clinton. It is reasonable to suspect that the feelings senior leaders had toward Clinton permeated through the ranks. It is clearly not an unusual phenomenon within the military for the feelings and attitudes of senior leaders to be reflected and emulated by junior soldiers. This, of course, is only speculative since inadequate research has been done. What is indisputable, however, is that many senior military leaders demonstrated an inability and unwillingness to separate the policies from the politician. This is arguably the greatest threat to civilian control of the military. As the famed historian S.E. Finer noted: "The moment the military draw this fine distinction between the nation and the government in power, they begin to

---

[142] Linda B. Miller, Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College, provided the following observation: "President Clinton quickly backed away from the more 'muscular' stances he had adopted during the campaign to persuade wary voters that the Democrats could be as 'strong' on defense as the Republicans, that they could move boldly beyond the Vietnam quagmire as President Bush claimed he had done during the Gulf War. What ties together the convoluted US reactions in these cases is Clinton's unswerving desire to avoid the placing of American troops in physical danger. As a result, the administration had denied itself the credibility it needs to back up its diplomacy…the general perception at home and abroad is that such threats must not and will not put American forces in 'harm's way', even if the results of such self-denial may erode the possibility of securing favorable outcomes." (Linda B. Miller, "The Clinton Years: Reinventing US Foreign Policy?," *International Affairs* (October 1994): 627.)

invent their own private notion of national interest, and from this it is only a skip to the constrained substitution of this view for that of the civilian government."[143]

IV. Conclusion

It was proposed early in this monograph that civil-military relations could be evaluated as being "good" or "bad" using the following evaluation criterion: if the military position prevails, there is a problem in civilian control; if the civilian position prevails, there is no problem.[144] Despite indictments to the contrary by the "crisis camp," research findings reflected in this monograph indicate that civilian supremacy over the military was firmly preserved during the Clinton administration. This would indicate that Clinton maintained "good" civilian control over the military. However, Clinton's ability to maintain "good" civilian control was, at best, a Pyrrhic victory. While Clinton successfully moved the armed forces in the direction he deemed best, the tension and friction produced by his decisions yielded one of most dysfunctional civil-military partnerships of any administration. Much of the civil-military friction derived from Clinton's inability to provide the military a national strategy which coherently encapsulated his vision. Tensions were further heightened when Clinton demonstrated an immense reluctance to heed professional military advisement and an unabashed willingness to challenge military culture. However, the military was equally at fault for maintaining poor civil-military relationship. In some instances, this was painfully obvious. For example, the harsh open criticism and biting comments rendered by several senior military leaders against Clinton clearly overstepped professional boundaries. In other cases it was more subtle, such as the publication of Powell's opinion pieces in *Foreign Affairs* and the *New York Times* which specifically admonished the employment of military force in the manner Clinton would use throughout his administration.

---

[143] S.E. Finer, *The Man on Horseback* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962), 26.

[144] This is the evaluation criterion proposed by Michael Desch, Director of the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, in his book *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment*. (p. 4)

These episodes clearly portrayed the polarization between the civilian and military leadership on key national security issues.

Civil-military relations are largely conditional. The works of Cohen and Herspring emphasize the conditional aspects of civil-military relations by evaluating how the interaction between the two entities is affected by the personalities of the civilian and military leadership. Though civil-military relations are conditional, Huntington maintains that this relationship is founded upon expectations. The military expects the civilian leadership to accept that the military is most adept in military matters. As such, there is an expectation that the civilian leadership will heavily weigh their professional military advisement. The civilian leadership, in turn, expects the military to execute as directed when a decision has been reached. Unfortunately, civil-military relations during the Clinton administration were marred by failed expectations from both entities.

The "crisis camp" justifiably questions the appropriateness of active-duty officers rendering public statements that opposed the Clinton administration's official position. Undoubtedly there is a poorly defined line where military leaders are no longer advising, but rather demanding the civilian leadership adopt the military's position. The "crisis camp" insists that Powell brazenly crossed this line. This is rather one-sided. If officers felt compelled, as Powell did, to present their professional position to media outlets, it may have, in fact, inferred that the civilian leaders exerted too much influence over the military. The fact that there was a marked increase of statements and protests in the media by senior military leaders against Clinton's desire to expand the military's role and mission may have indicated that official channels were blocked. It is possible that the military perceived that the only recourse it had to ensure their position was heard was to open the lines of communication to the media and to sympathetic politicians on Capitol Hill. While the military's use of these channels may have been traditionally deemed nefarious, this was no longer the case. The military had steadily evolved

from an apolitical organization to one of the nation's most influential bureaucracies. Consequently, the military, like any bureaucracy, utilized Congress and the media to defend itself and further its interests.[145]

There are, however, steps that can be implemented to mitigate perceptions of future "civil-military crises." This monograph proposed that civil-military conflict and the perceived decline of civilian control during the Clinton administration were the result of undefined labor divisions between military and political leaders in the post-Cold War environment. This confusion was largely attributed to the absence of relevant civil-military models which addressed the delineation of labor between the military and political leaders. Therefore, to prevent future civil-military crisis, it is first necessary that a relevant civil-military model or theory be developed. In order for this new civil-military model to be relevant it must account for the changes in military structure and organization under the GNA, reflect the current and anticipated strategic environment, and accurately assess and account for the political and bureaucratic nature of the armed forces. The military and civilian leadership can no longer turn to or rely upon civil-military theories which simply idealize how civil-military relations ought to be. Identifying a division of labor between civilian and military responsibilities will never be effectively reconciled unless such a model or theory is produced.

Civil-military relations straddle a fault line during transition periods between administrations. Therefore, a second recommendation is that the incoming president must establish his defense advisory team as soon as he is elected. All key positions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Defense of Department (DOD) need to be filled when the incoming president assumes office. Clinton needlessly erred by waiting several weeks before filling key vacancies within the OSD and DOD. Additionally, an incoming president should not use civilian defense and security advisory positions as a reward for campaign performance, but

---

[145] Dale R. Herspring, *The Pentagon and the Presidency*, 2.

rather only appoint individuals who have the talent and capacity to execute these critical duties. Moreover, all individuals assuming these positions must have some understanding and appreciation for military culture. Again, Clinton failed to appoint people with an understanding of military culture despite the constant interaction with military leaders required by the duty position. Such measures could significantly reduce civil-military friction during these transition periods.

One cannot understate how critical it is that civilian appointees to the Department of Defense be of the highest caliber. It took several years after the enactment of the GNA for the military to finally recognize the importance and merit of sending quality officers to Joint billets. The civilian side must follow suit. As security concerns call for increased inter-agency relationships, the need for quality civilian representation becomes more pronounced. Military professionalism ensures that the military will never shirk on its responsibility to address security matters. Due to the military's preparedness, it will inevitably be directed or compelled to assume the lead on security matters if civilian counterparts prove to be incapable. An overrepresentation of the military in security matters will certainly lead to accusations of an "over-militarization" in national policy. This will undoubtedly provoke observers to assert there is erosion in civilian control of the military. Placing only the best qualified civilian appointees in these positions would dispel perceptions of an "over-militarization" in national policy.

Civil-military relations were strained from the moment Clinton assumed office. One of the key factors contributing to this was the clash of personalities between the incoming administration and the Joint Staff. Since civil-military relations are conditional upon personalities, it is worth consideration that the tenure of the JCS coincide with each administration; that is, a new CJCS and JCS should transition in and out with each administration. Much of ensuing tension between Powell and Clinton was due to Powell's inability to transition between the leadership styles and strategic visions of Bush to Clinton. It is worth noting that

friction between Clinton and the CJCS was greatly reduced when General Shalikashvili, who espoused many of Clinton's views and positions, was appointed as Powell's successor. The fact is the SECDEF and President will only nominate an officer for the CJCS if the officer reflects the positions and views of the administration. Therefore, it is proposed that a transition of the JCS occurs when a new administration assumes office.

Third, the civilian leadership cannot shirk on their responsibilities to the military. The most crucial duty the civilian leadership has is to define national policy and develop a grand strategy. The military cannot effectively support a president's vision unless this is done. The GNA requires the president to submit his NSS within no less than a hundred fifty days from assuming office. Clinton failed in his responsibility to the military by not submitting his NSS until he had been in office for over eighteen months. No administration can afford to sacrifice the nation's interests and defense by neglecting the duties and responsibilities as mandated by the GNA.

Fourth, senior military leaders must refrain from voicing their personal opinion or analysis of national security matters to media outlets. This is the most telling indication that there are differences and disputes between the civilian and military leadership. It is important to note that voicing opinion to media outlets is vastly different from an officer providing his professional opinion and analysis in testimony to Congress. In such cases, the officer is obligated to provide Congress with his professional evaluation, even if it contradicts the administration. As such, an officer should never be blamed if the media exposes any contradictions revealed during such testimony. Similarly, political leaders should not use the military as a means to increase their public appeal. Politicians, particularly during election years, cite their unyielding support and devotion to the military. This generates the perception that the military is supporting a specific candidate or aligned with a political party. Politicians must take careful measure not to needlessly drag the military into partisan disputes or the political arena.

Finally, the military is equally responsible to adapt to the president's leadership style. Civil-military conflict usually occurs because the president's leadership style is at odds with that of the military. This implies that there is an expectation for the president to adjust his leadership style, lest he lose credibility and confidence from the military. This seems backwards. The military is equally responsible for supplanting its preferences so that it may better accommodate the president.

This monograph sought to answer how civil-military relations changed prior to and during the Clinton administration to convince many observers that American control had declined to a point of crisis. It was argued that the perceived decline of civilian control of the military was attributed to three key and highly encompassing factors: 1.) a lack of strategy in the post-Cold War environment; 2.) the rise of military institutional competence and influence; and 3.) the personality and character of President Clinton. Any one of these factors could undoubtedly increase civil-military tensions within any administration. However, President Clinton entered office during an unpredictable time in which his lack of vision, conflicting leadership style, and questionable character failed to provide the direction the military demanded. As a result, the military, under the direction of General Powell, forged a strategy that it deemed was relevant to the new strategic environment. Yet, despite the "crisis camp's" declaration that civilian control of the military had eroded, this was simply not true.

President Clinton demonstrated little interest or knowledge in national and international security issues. This was evident by his ill-defined National Security Strategy, poorly articulated national interests and objectives, and eagerness to further reduce defense spending despite the increased frequency of military operational deployments. The military's reaction against Clinton's perceived apathy and indifference toward national security matters and the armed forces were certainly not unwarranted. While one may argue against the methods employed by General Powell to voice his professional opinion on the proper use of military force, he remained duty

bound to provide the political leadership such assessment. Powell's demand for the administration to provide narrowly defined objectives and strategies was undeniably required; all civil-military models cite that this is the primary responsibility of the civilian leadership to the military. Many senior leaders who had experienced the travesty associated with poorly defined objectives and "mission creep" during the Vietnam War sought to avoid the same from occurring during the Clinton administration. The "crisis camp" equates this resistance as an indication of a decline in civilian control. This is an unfortunate observation. Just as the political leaders are entitled to question military professionals on military affairs, the military must be granted the same. Expecting or demanding the military to simply salute and obey is reckless. Committing military forces while lacking a national policy, strategic objectives, and an exit strategy, as Clinton had done, is negligent. Demanding the political leaders to provide answers to what national goals are to be achieved, as General Powell did, is exactly what prevents soldiers and resources from being squandered.

The divisions of labor between the military and civilian echelon were in a state of fluctuation since the end of the Cold War and the enactment of GNA. The end of the Cold War meant that national policies needed to change because many were no longer relevant. Clinton's aversion to foreign and security policy created a void that the military, with authority bestowed upon Powell through the GNA, was willing to fill. The "crisis camp" correctly observes that the military had a larger role in the development of national policy. This was because the GNA authorized the military increased participation. Clinton's aversion to the military further enabled senior military leaders to maximize their participation. The armed services recognized that the expertise of its officers would no longer be narrowly confined to the "management of violence" as in the past. Officers needed to become more versed on national policy matters in order to be most effective and persuasive within the political arena. Ultimately, however, it is up to the political leadership to support or dismiss any recommendation that is forwarded by the

professional soldier. If the military's policy recommendations were approved during the Clinton

administration, it was because they most closely reflected the position and preference of the

political leadership. It does not, however, indicate an erosion of civilian control.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacevich A.J., "Civilian Control: A Useful Fiction?," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Autumn/Winter 1994-1995): 76-79.

_____, "The Paradox of Professionalism: Eisenhower, Ridgway, and the Challenge to Civilian Control, 1953-1955," *The Journal of Military History* 61, no. 2 (April 1997): 303-333.

Bletz, Donald F., *The Role of The Military Professional in U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Blumenthal, Sidney. *The Clinton Wars*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.

Bourne, Christopher M., "Unintended Consequences of the Goldwater-Nichols Act," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Spring 1998): 99-108.

Brunea, Thomas C. and Scott D. Tollefson. *Who Guards the Guardians and How: Democratic Civil-Military Relations*. Austin: University of Austin Press, 2006.

Burk, James, "Theories of Democratic Civil-Military Relations," *Armed Forces & Society* 29, no.1 (Fall 2002): 7-29.

Bush, George H.W. and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed*. New York: Random House Publishing, 1998.

Cheney, Dick B., "Military Goals Will Produce 'Hollow' Force: Criticism of President Clinton's Military Policy" http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_n49_v10/ai_15981024;

Cohen, Eliot A., *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen and Leadership in Wartime*. New York: The Free Press, 2002.

Collins, Joseph T. and Ole R. Holsti, "How Wide is the Gap?," *International Security* 24, no. 2 (Autumn 1999): 199-207. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539257

Davis, Vincent, ed. "Civil-Military Relations and the Not-Quite Wars of the Present and Future," Strategic Studies Institute (30 October 1996).

Desch, Michael C., *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Dunlap, Charles J., "The Origins of the American Military Coup of 2012," *Parameters* (Winter 1992-93): 2-20. http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/1992/dunlap.htm

Feaver, Peter D., "An American Crisis in Civilian Control and Civil-Military Relations?," *The Tocqueville Review* 17, no.1 (1996): 159-182.

_____, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces and Society* 23, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 149-178.

_____, "Crisis as Shirking: An Agency Theory Explanation of the Souring of American Civil-Military Relations," *Armed Forces and Society* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1998): 407-434.

Finer, S.E., *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. Publishing, 1962.

Foster, Gregory D., "Failed Expectations: The Crisis of Civil-Military Relations in America," The Brookings Institute (Fall 1997). http://www.brookings.edu/articles/1997/fall_defense_fpster.aspx

Goldstein, Lyle J., "General John Shalikashvili and the Civil-Military Relations of Peacekeeping," *Armed Forces & Society* 26, no.3 (Spring 2000): 387-411.

Gray, Colin C., *War, Peace, and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 2003.

Greenstein, Fred I., "The Presidential Leadership Style of Bill Clinton: An Early Appraisal," Political Science Quarterly 108, no. 4 (Winter 1993-1994): 589-601.

Gregor, William J., "Toward a Revolution in Civil-Military Affairs: Understanding the United States Military in the Post Cold War World," John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies

Herspring, Dale R., *The Pentagon and the Presidency: Civil-Military Relations from FDR to George W. Bush.* Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Hillen, John, "General Chaos," *National Review* (31 December 1996): 21.

Holsti, Ole R., "A Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and Civilian Society?: Some Evidence, 1976-96," *International Security* 23, no.3 (Winter 1998-1999): 5-42.

Hooker, Richard D., "Soldiers of the State: Reconsidering American Civil-Military Relations," *Parameters* 33, no.4 (Winter 2003-2004): 4-18.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Janowitz, Morris. *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Johnson, Douglas and Steven Metz, "American Civil-Military Relations: New Issues, Enduring Problems," Strategic Studies Institute (24 April 1995).

Kaufman, William W., "Hollow Forces?: Current Issues of U.S. Military Readiness and Effectiveness," *Brookings Review*, 12 (Fall, 1994).

Kirkpatrick, Charles E., *An Unknown Future and A Doubtful Present: Writing the Victory Plan of 1941.* http://www.ibiblio.org/hyperwar/USA/USA-Victory/

Kohn, Richard H., "Coming Soon: A Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," *World Affairs* (Winter 2008): 69-80.

_____, "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States," *Naval War College Review* 55, no.3 (Summer 2002): 9-59.

_____, "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," The National Interest (Spring 1994). http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=10280

Luttwak, Edward, "Washington's Biggest Scandal," *Commentary* (May 1994). http://www.commentarymagazine.com/viewarticle.cfm/washingtons-biggest-scandal-8246

Longley Charles H., "McNamara and Military Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science* 18, no.1 (February 1974): 1-21.

Lovelace, Douglas C., "Unification of the United States Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act," Strategic Studies Institute (6 August 1996).

Lovelace, Douglas C. and Thomas-Durell Young, "U.S. Department Of Defense Strategic Planning: The Missing Nexus," Strategic Studies Institute (1 September 1995).

Miller, Linda B., "The Clinton Years: Reinventing U.S. Foreign Policy?," *International Affairs* 70, no. 4 (October 1994): 621-634. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2624550

Moskos, Charles C., "The Military," *Annual Review of Sociology* 2 (1976): 55-77.

O'Hanlon, Michael, "Clinton's Strong Defense Legacy," *Foreign Affairs* 82, no.6 (November/December 2003): 126-134.

_____, "Ready or Not?: Has Clinton Weakened America's Defenses?" http://www.slate.com/id/82762/

Owens, Mackubin Thomas, "Civilian Control: A National Crisis?," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Autumn/Winter 1994-1995): 80-83.

Patterson, Robert. *Dereliction of Duty: The Eyewitness Account of How Bill Clinton Compromised America's National Security*. Washington D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc, 2003.

Powell, Colin L. with Joseph E. Persico. *My American Journey*. New York: Random House, 1995.

Powell, Colin L., "U.S. Forces: Challenges Ahead," *Foreign Affairs* (Winter 1992-1993). http://www.cfr.org/publication/7508/us_forces.html

Powell, Colin L., John Lehman, William Odom, and Richard H. Kohn, "An Exchange on Civil-Military Relations: Comments on Richard Kohn," *The National Interest* (Spring 1994). http://www.nationalinterest.org/General.aspx?id=92&id2=10640

Ricks, Thomas E., "The Widening Gap Between the Military and Society," *The Atlantic* (July 1997). http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/97jul/milsoc.htm

Sarkesian, Sam C., "Political Soldiers: Perspectives on Professionalism in the U.S. Military," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 16, no.2 (May 1972): 239-258.

Sechser, Todd S., "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48, no. 5 (October 2004): 746-774.

Snider, Don M., "The National Security Strategy: Documenting Strategic Vision," Strategic Studies Institute (15 March 1995).

Snider, Don M. and Gayle L. Watkins, "The Future of Army Professionalism: A Need for Renewal and Redefinition," *Parameters* 30, no.3 (Autumn 2000): 5-20.

Snider, Don M. and Miranda A. Carlton-Carew, eds. *U.S. Civil-Military Relations: In Crisis or Transition?*. Washington D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1995.

Weigley, Russell F., "The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell," *The Journal of Military History* 57, no.5 (October 1993): 27-58.

Weinberger, Casper W., "The Uses of Military Power." http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/military/force/weinberger.html

Wilson, Peter H., "Defining Military Culture," *The Journal of Military History* 72, no.1 (January 2008): 11-41.